SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

No SUFFICIENT

REASON

For Restoring the

PRAYERS and DIRECTIONS

OF

King *Edward* the Sixth's

FIRST

LITURGY;

PART I.

By a *NON-JUROR.*

In Vain do they Worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men, St. Mark vii. 7.
He said unto them, Full well ye reject the Commandments of God, that ye may keep your own Tradition, Ver. 9.

Si solus Christus audiendus est, non debemus attendere, quid alius ante nos faciendum putaverit, sed quid, qui ante omnes Christus, prior fecerit. Neque enim hominis consuetudinem sequi oportet, sed Dei veritatem. *B. Cypr. Epist.* lxiii. *ad Cæcil.*

LONDON:
Printed for *John Morphew* near *Stationers-Hall.*
1718. [Price 1 s. 6 d.]

AC 911.1718.S64

ERRATA.

PAGE 3. Line 20. Read *Epheſ.* ii. 20. p. 7. l. 8. r. *Scriptures.* p. 11. l. 31. r. ; p. 12. l. 33. r. *p.* 101. p. 17. l. ult. r. *Lit.* p. 35. l. 28. r. *Promiſes.* p. 38. l. 6. del. *cited.* p. 41. l. 34. r. ἐνφραινεν. p. 46. l. 7. r. For ſo *Juſtin.* p. 52. l. 33. r. σπονδαί· and l. antep. r. ὄνομα· p. 58. l. 14. for *it.* r. *the Neceſſity of it.* p. 70. l. 33. r. *Sacrificium.* p. 82. l. 16. r. *thinks that.* p. 98. l. 18. r. *Side.* p. 113. l. 8. for *us.* r. *Chriſtians.*

THE CONTENTS.

Introduction. Page 1

The Design of the whole. 2

I. *Scripture, not Tradition, the Christian's Rule shewn from Scripture.* Ibid.

And from Tradition. 6

Pleas for Tradition. 22

1. *That Tradition stands recommended by Scripture it self.* Ibid.

2. *That we our selves are forced to fly to it in some Cases.* 26

II. *The Tradition for the Articles contended for is not so full as it is represented to be.* 36

1. *It is not so Extensive as is pretended.* Ibid.

2. *And where it does extend, it is not so full and satisfactory as it is given out to be.* 44

The Testimony of Justin Martyr *considered.* Ibid.

As also those of Irenæus *and* Clemens Alexandrinus. 50

And of St. Cyprian. 53 & 73

Some truly Apostolical Usages not thought necessary to be Revived. 70

To receive the Eucharist after Supper, at least, as necessary as the Mixture. 73

Of the Jewish Talmud. 74, 104, & 107

The Custom of communicating Infants. 76

That our Bleſſed Saviour gives not the leaſt Hint of any Thing in the Cup, but Wine. 77
Our Saviour's Cup not neceſſarily mixt. 78
St. Paul's *calling it* the Cup of Bleſſing. Ibid.
Our Saviour an Antitype to Melchiſedeck. 82
And to Noah. 86
The Drink-Offering amongſt the Jews. 87
Of the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. 88
The Liturgies of St. Baſil *and St.* Chryſoſtom, *no good Evidence in this Caſe.* p. 89
Nor the Council of Carthage. 91
Nor that in Trullo. Ibid.
That Wine only is mentioned in Scripture becauſe of its being a principal Ingredient, is a Begging the Queſtion. 99
Of Moſes's *ſprinkling the People, Hebr.* ix. 19. 103
According to Dr. Lightfoot, *he that drinks Wine not mingled at the Paſſover, performs his Duty.* 106
The Mixture uncommanded by the Moſaick *Inſtitution.* Ibid.
Dr. Lightfoot *cited to prove the Wine our Saviour uſed at the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt was mixt.* 107
Buxtorf *notes there were four Cups at the Paſſover.* 110
The Importance of what Plutarch *ſays of* Κρᾶμα. 111
Dr. Lightfoot *rightly cited, when ſpeaking of the Mixture as a convenient Rite.* 112
An unhappy Queſtion. 113
No Cup ſaid to be purpoſely mixed by our Saviour till the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. Ibid.
Whether our Saviour kept the Paſſover with Unleavened Bread. 114
Whether he took the mixt Cup, only becauſe it was ready at Hand. 117
Chriſtians as much at Liberty to uſe unmixt Wine, as Leavened Bread. 118
The Concluſion. 119

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

THIS Reply having grown to a greater Length than was designed, I thought it best, for more Reasons than one, to send out this Part first. Which had been Published some Weeks sooner, but that it has stuck much longer in the Press, than was expected. The other Part I promise my self will follow in a little time. At present I shall only subjoin a few Citations relating to the Mixture, that did not occur soon enough to be inserted in their proper Places.

Page 41. After these Words, *Remembrance of me*, these should follow. And in his 7th Homily on *Levit.* x. he speaks of *Wine*, and *new Wine*, and *new Wine* to be put into new Bottles, and new Wine in the Kingdom of Heaven, but without the least Hint of any Water to be mixt with it. And *Cyril* of *Jerusalem* puts the Question, (*a*) *Since our Saviour changed the Water, at the Feast at* Cana *in* Galilee *into Wine, why cannot he as well change Wine into his Blood?* Now it is agreed on all Hands, that our Saviour did not change the Water into Wine and Water, but into Wine only. And St. *Cyril* makes no difference betwixt this Wine, and that which he made his Blood. And a little after; (*b*) *In the Type of Bread he gave his*

Pag. 41.

(*a*) Τὸ ὕδωρ πρὸ εἰς οἶνον μεταβέβληκεν, ἐν Κανᾷ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, οἰκείῳ θελήματι· καὶ ἐκ ἀξιόπιστός ἐστιν οἶνον μεταβαλὼν εἰς αἷμα; *Catech. Mystag.* iv. p. 292.

(*b*) Ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ ἄρτου, δέδοταί σοι τὸ σῶμα· καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἴνου δέδοταί σοι τὸ αἷμα. *Ibid.*

Body,

Body, and in the Type of [not of Water and Wine, but barely of] *Wine he gave his Blood.*

Pag. 52. At the End of *Page* 52. the Reader may please to add these Words. *Theodorus Mopsuestenus*, never charged with Heterodoxy in this Point, testifies that Κέρασμα does not always signify a Mixture. For when commenting upon the lxxivth *Psalm* as it is in the *Septuagint*-Translation, but in the *Hebrew* the lxxvth, *ver.* 9. (*c*) *He hath*, says he, *in his Hand a Cup full of unmixt Wine; and that he may intimate the more terrible Punishments to be meant by this Wine not being mixt, he says of an unmingled* κέρασμα. *But how is it that having spoken of Wine unmixed, he immediately says it is mixed? The Reason of this is, because we often call such a quantity of Liquor as may suffice for a Draught, a* Κρᾶσις, [which Word signifies also a Mixture.] *The Psalmist's Intent therefore in this place is to declare, that hereby is meant such a large Quantity as to fill the Cup. He would therefore by both Words express the Intenseness of the Punishment spoken of; that is to say, both by the Wine being unmixt, and by it's filling the Cup; by the Pureness of the Wine, shewing the Severity and Vehemence of it, and by its Fulness, the Sufficiency of it, so as to extend to all.*

(*c*) Ἔχει γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἑαυτῆ χειρὶ ποτήριον πεπληρωμένον ἀκράτου οἴνου· ἵνα εἴπῃ φοβερωτέρας τιμωρίας, ἀπὸ τοῦτο ἄκρατον οἶνον μείζονων κολάσεων. Τὸ δὲ κεράσματος ἐ κεκραμένου λέγει· (πῶς γὰρ οἷόν τε ἀκράτου, πάλιν εἰπεῖν κεκραμένου;) ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ κρᾶσιν πολλάκις καλοῦμεν τὸ μέτρον, ὃ πρὸς πόσιν ἀρκεῖ. Τοῦτο βουλόμενος εἰπεῖν, ὅτι παντὸς κρᾶσιν, ὅτου μεγίστου ὥστε πληρῶσαι τὸ ποτήριον. Βούλεται δὲ εἰπεῖν ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων τῆς τιμωρίας τὴν ἔμφασιν. Καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἄκρατον εἶναι τὸν οἶνον, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πεπληρῶσαι τὸ ποτήριον· τῷ μὲν ἀκράτῳ τὸ αὐστηρὸν καὶ ἔκφυλον δεικνύς, τῷ δὲ πλήρει τὸ διαρκὲς, καὶ πάντων ἁπλόμενον. *Corder. Caten. Græc. Patrum in Psalm.* lxxiv. 9.

St.

St. *Athanaſius* ſpeaking of our Saviour's *having prepared a Table*, explains it thus, (*d*) *That is to ſay the holy Altar, and upon that the heavenly Bread, and which gives Life to all that partake of it, even his holy and moſt holy Body, and Wine, that chears the Heart, and yet works Sobriety in the Soul of every one of thoſe that taſte of it, as if he poured his own Blood into the Cup.*

Agreeably whereto the lxxii render *Prov.* ix. 2. Ἐκέρασεν εἰς κρατῆρα τὸν ἑαυτῆς οἶνον. Of which I deſire it may be conſidered, whether the moſt natural Conſtruction of theſe Words, be not, *She hath poured her Wine into the Cup, or ſhe has prepared her Cup*; rather than ſhe hath mingled her Wine in it?

After what is ſaid concerning *Melchiſedeck's* Oblation as a Type of our Saviour's, *Page* 86. it may follow, (*e*) To this purpoſe St. *Athanaſius* calls the Wine he gave to *Abraham* ἄκρατον, *unmixt*, *Pag. 86.*

(*d*) Περιθεικὰς τράπεζαν, τυτέστι τὸ ἅγιον θυσιαστήριον, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἄρτον ἐπάνιον καὶ ἄφθαρτον, καὶ πᾶσι ζωὴν χαριζόμενον τοῖς μεταλαμβάνουσιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ, τὸ ἅγιον καὶ πανάγιον αὐτοῦ σῶμα, οἶνόν τε εὐφραίνοντα τὴν καρδίαν, καὶ νῆψιν ἐμποιοῦντα ἐν τῇ ἐκάστε ψυχῇ τῶν ἀπογευομένων ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ὅτι κρατῆρα κεράσας τὸ ἑαυτοῦ αἷμα. *B. Athanaſ. in Nic. Conc. c. Arium Diſp. To.* 2. p. 122. *I own this Treatiſe is thought not to be genuine, and cannot therefore be appealed to for ſettling any Doctrine, yet I ſee not why it may not be uſed, for ſhewing the Nature and Senſe of the Language it is written in.*

(*e*) Ὡς δὲ ἀπήντησεν ὁ Μελχισεδὲκ τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὑποστρέφοντι ἀπὸ τῆς κοπῆς τῶν Βασιλέων, ἐπέδωκεν αὐτῷ πλήρωμα ἄκρατον, ὑπερβαλῶν αὐτὸν καὶ κλάσμα ἄρτου, καὶ τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ πᾶν. Καὶ ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας κατὰ τοῦτον τρόπον ὁμοιοῦται τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ. Ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰς χάειν· ἀλλ' ἔστω τύπος πρῶτος ἐγένετο τοῦ ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν προσφέρειν, τὴν ἁγίαν προσφορὰν· διὸ λέγει σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, ἐπειδὴ τύπος ἐγένετο τῆς ἁγίας προσφορᾶς, ὑπεδεδώκως τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ τοῖς πᾶσι. *B. Athanaſ. Hiſt. in Melchiſ.* Vol. 2. p. 9.

and

and affirms that he was *the Type of the unbloody Sacrifice*, θυσίας ἀναιμάκτου.

So *Eusebius* speaking of *Melchisedeck* relates, (*f*) That *he blessed* Abraham *with Wine ONLY and Bread.* And to the same Effect also says St. *Augustine*; (*g*) *There first appeared the Sacrifice, which is now* [so long after] *offered to God by Christians all the World over, and then was fulfilled that which was done a long time after it was said by the Prophet to Christ, who was to come in the Flesh; thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchisedeck.*

(*f*) Οἴνῳ δὲ μόνῳ καὶ ἄρτῳ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ εὐλογῶν. *Demonstr. Evang.* l. 5. c. 3.

(*g*) Ibi quippe primum apparuit Sacrificium, quod nunc à Christianis ode tur Deo toto terrarum orbe, impleturque illud quod l ngè post hoc factum, per Prophetam dicitur ad Christum, Tu es sacerdos in æternum secundùm ordinem Melchisedeck. *B. Aug. de Civ. Dei.* l. 16. c. 22.

No

No ſufficient

REASON

For Reſtoring the Prayers, &c.

SINCE it is reſolved this unhappy Controverſy ſhall be carried on, we who cannot come into the Meaſures propoſed, ſhould be thought much wanting to our Cauſe, if we ſhould not continue to ſhew the Reaſon of our Diſſent. I ſhould have thought it no ſmall Happineſs, if this Labour might have been ſpared, and the Diſpute dropt. But our learned Author having thought fit, to publiſh a Defence of the former Reaſons, I hope I ſhall be excuſed, if I take upon me to appear againſt it; in behalf not only of the Conſtitution of our own Church, but of our Bleſſed Saviour's Inſtitution likewiſe; both which are apparently on our Side. As to our own Church, there is no Diſpute, but that we keep cloſeſt to its Rules and Practices, and thereby acquit our ſelves its moſt genuine Sons and faithful Members. And as to the Doctrines of the *New Teſtament*, and our Saviour's Inſtitution of the Holy *Euchariſt* in particular, every one muſt ſee that the Scripture being the Meaſure we go by, there can be no juſtifiable Reaſon for any One's dividing from us upon this Account. And to ſhew that there is not, I ſhall ſet my ſelf to make good theſe two following Propoſitions.

I. Scripture, and not Tradition, is prescribed by our Lord to his Disciples, as the Rule they are to walk by, and which we are necessarily to adhere to.

II The Tradition pleaded for the four controverted Points, is not so full and unquestionable, as it is represented to be. If either of these Propositions, much more if both of them, can be proved to be true, the Pleas brought for the Essentiality of the Usages now contended for, must necessarily be acknowledged to be false. And by consequence, the Practices built upon those Pleas, must be Erroneous and Ill-grounded. And that this is the true State of the Case, I come now to shew. And here I say,

I. Scripture, and not Tradition, is prescribed by our Saviour to his Disciples, as the Rule for them to walk by, and which we are all necessarily to adhere to, for the Guidance of our Faith, and Worship, and our Behaviour in all Respects. To *the Law and to the Testimony*; says the Prophet *Isaiah*, *if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no Light in them*, Is. viii. 20. And again, *Seek ye out of the Book of the Lord, and read*, *ch.* xxxiv. 16. And so in the New Testament, *Search the Scriptures*, says our Saviour, St. *John* v. 39. And in the *Acts of the Apostles*, *ch* xvii. 11. The *Jews* at *Berœa* are commended as *more Noble*, of a milder and better Temper and Disposition, than those at *Thessalonica*, and for this Reason, *because they received the Word with all Readiness of Mind, and searched the Scriptures daily.* And indeed, that not Tradition, but Scripture, is the Rule for our Direction, is a Doctrine so agreeable to our most holy Profession, and has been so fully proved from time to time, that whensoever any Competition arises between them, I thought

thought there was no Room for doubting, whether of them were chiefly to be relied upon.

As to Rites and Ceremonies and all Matters of Indifferency, it is and must be in the Choice of every Church, to determine what they shall see proper, for their own People and Circumstances; unless it be resolved they shall have no Power left them, to order any Thing in the Worship of God. Which would be highly unreasonable, when every Master of a Family may do it in his own House. But in all the Essentials of Religion, the Case is very different; for here we are obliged to keep to the Laws of God, and the Directions of our Blessed Saviour and his Apostles, recorded in the holy Scripture. Nor could I ever learn that bare Tradition was sufficient of it self, to make any Thing a necessary indispensable Duty, that has no Foundation at all in Scripture. And I cannot find that the Points here insisted upon have. St. *Paul* teaches that the Church is *built upon the Apostles and Prophets*, and especially upon our blessed Lord and Saviour, as its *chief Corner-stone, and* not the Apostles and Prophets, and our Lord himself upon the Church. Our Saviour confuted the *Sadducees* from Scripture, St. *Matt.* xxii. 32. St. *Paul* confuted the false Apostles from Scripture, *Gal.* iii. 10. The Fathers in their Disputations with Hereticks, appealed to Scripture. But now we are taught to betake our selves not to Scripture, but Tradition, the Fathers, and the *Jewish Rabbies*; which though all of Use in their proper Place, yet are by no means to be compared to Scripture, or set in opposition to it.

Tradition, as the Answerer had said (*a*) before, may be of Use for confirming, what is delivered

(*a*) *No Reason*, p. 53.

in Scripture, though not ſo fully and clearly as ſome other Doctrines are. But when our Saviour, in the Inſtitution of the holy Euchariſt, mentions nothing more in the Cup than (*b*) *the Fruit of the Vine*, it wants yet to be proved, after all our learned Author has ſaid, in behalf of a Mixture, that not Wine alone, but only as diluted with Water, ſuch as never proceeded from the Vine, can be the only proper Eſſential Matter of the Cup in this Ordinance, or how any Tradition can evince it to be ſo. In like manner, when neither our Saviour nor his Apoſtles have given any Manner of Direction, about Prayers for the Saints departed this Life, nor have acquainted us what their Condition is now, before the Reſurrection, or that their Happineſs is capable of being any way improved by our Prayers, how unſcriptural Tradition can ever make theſe Prayers eſſential to Chriſtianity, and of abſolute Neceſſity in order to Salvation, is a Paradox too hard to be maintained. And the like I may ſay alſo of the other Alterations propoſed. Whatſoever may be offered otherwiſe in their behalf, their not being taught in Scripture, is an Objection not to be removed. Nor can they ever be proved, to be neceſſary Parts of our moſt holy Religion, to the Satisfaction of thoſe who believe the Scripture to be the Rule of our Faith, and Life, and Worſhip, as our Church profeſſes to do, as well as the Reformed Churches abroad.

(*c*) *That whatſoever is not read in Scripture, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it ſhould be believed as an Article of Faith, or be thought requiſite or neceſſary to Salvation*, is

---

(*b*) St. *Matt.* xxvi. 29.
(*c*) *Artic.* VI.

undoubtedly

undoubtedly the Doctrine of the Church of *England*; and not so only, but moreover of the (*d*) *Augustan*, the (*e*) *Helvetick*, the (*f*) *Wirtenburgh*, and the (*g*) *Bohemian* Confessions. And indeed it is the true Basis of the whole Reformation. And the Truth hereof might be easily evinced, by a plentiful Cloud of Witnesses, both from Scripture and other Ecclesiastical Writers, both in former and latter Ages, were there any Need of it. But that Tradition should be set in Competition with it, to be received *pari pietatis affectu*, is a Doctrine of the (*h*) Council of *Trent*, but not to be met with in Scripture, nor the Doctrines of the Primitive Church.

So that I may well affirm in the Words of our great Archbishop, that (*i*) *Some Traditions I deny not to be true and firm, and of great both Authority and Use in the Church, as Apostolical, but yet not Fundamental in the Faith.* And again, (*k*) *Not the Church of* England *only, but all Protestants agree, most truly and most strongly in this*, says the forenamed Great Prelate, *That the Scripture is sufficient to Salvation, and contains in it all Things necessary to it. And have not we Reason then to account it, as it is, the Foundation* of our Faith.

And it is well known, that the Apostle St. *Paul* denounces a severe *Anathema* against either Angel, or Man, (*l*) that ventures to teach any other

---

(*d*) *Corp. Confessionum*, p. 1.
(*e*) *Ibid.* p. 67.
(*f*) *Ibid.* p. 131.
(*g*) Pag. 177.
(*h*) *Sess.* 4.
(*i*) *Laud* against *Fisher*, §. 11. Numb. 2.
(*k*) *Sect.* 15. *Numb.* 1.
(*l*) Cum ergo neque ipse Apostolus, neq; Angelus de cælo, annunciare possit aliter aut docere, præterquam quod semel Christus

other Doctrine than what our Lord himſelf and his Apoſtles had taught, *Gal.* i. 8, 9. Which deſerves to be ſeriouſly attended to, and well conſidered, by all ſuch as ſet up Tradition againſt Scripture, whereby to make thoſe Doctrines or Uſages neceſſary to Salvation, which the Word of God has not made ſo. The Word of God, I ſay, *which is able to make a Man wiſe unto Salvation*, and *perfect to every good work*; as the ſame St. *Paul* affirms it does, 2 *Tim.* iii 15, 16, 17. For to make it effectual to our Salvation, it muſt contain in it all Things that are of abſolute Neceſſity, to be believed or practiſed by us. Becauſe if only ſome of our Duty is to be found there, and we muſt depend upon Tradition for the reſt, then Scripture is but a partial imperfect Rule to us, and not ſuch as the Apoſtle repreſents it to be. Nor have we Scripture only to this purpoſe, but Tradition too. *Ut quæ ſcripta ſunt non negamus, ita ea quæ non ſunt ſcripta renuimus*, ſays St. (*m*) *Jerom.* As we do not deny the Things which are written, ſo we do reject thoſe that are not written. And the ſame might eaſily be proved from Numbers of others, all from time to time unanimouſly confirming the ſame Doctrine. Thus (*n*) *Irenæus*, diſputing againſt the *Valentinians* and other Hereticks, ſets up *Scriptures* in oppoſition to their blaſphemous Conceits, (*o*) and Pro-

---

Chriſtus docuit, & Apoſtoli ejus annunciaverunt; miror ſatis unde hoc uſurpatum ſit, ut contra Evangelicam & Apoſtolicam Diſciplinam, quibuſdam in locis aqua offeratur in Dominico Calice, quæ ſola Chriſti ſanguinem non poſſit exprimere. S. *Cyprian, Epiſt.* 63. *p.* 152.

(*m*) *Adv. Helvid.* c. 9.

(*n*) Τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν γεγραφῶν ὀνόματα, καὶ τὰς λέξεις, καὶ τὰς ἀρχαιολογίας ἐπιγνώσεται, τὴν δὲ βλάσφημον ὑπόθεσιν ταύτην οὐκ ὀπιγνώσεται. *Adv. Hæreſ.* l. 1. c. 1.

(*o*) Ex ſcripturis ſic accipiet probationem. *L.* 2. *c.* 42.

miſes

miſes to diſprove their Tenets *from Scripture*. And upon another Occaſion ſpeaking of the Goſpel, he teaches that the Apoſtles (*p*) *delivered it to us in the Scriptures, to be the Foundation, and Pillar of our Faith.* As he alſo complains of the Hereticks againſt whom he was writing (*q*) that *when they are confuted out of Scripture, they ſet themſelves to accuſe the Scripture, as if we had them not right, or as if they wanted Authority, or as differently expreſsed, and becauſe Truth cannot be found out by their Help, except* BY SUCH AS ARE ACQUAINTED WITH TRADITION. Where we ſee his Charge againſt them was depending more upon *Tradition*, than upon the Holy Scriptures. And treating of their new (*r*) erroneous and blaſphemous Goſpel, he adds, that *they who will, may learn how it differs from the Goſpel of Truth, as is ſhewn out of the* SCRIPTURES. And at another time, diſcourſing of our Bleſſed Saviour's Incarnation, he tells them, (*ſ*) they are *confuted from thoſe Things which are related in the Scriptures, concerning the Coming of Chriſt.* Agreeably whereto *Tertullian* declares himſelf to (*t*) *adore the Fulneſs of*

(*p*) Per Dei voluntatem in ſcripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei noſtræ futurum. *L.* 3. *c* 1.

(*q*) Cum arguuntur ex Scripturis, in accuſationem convertuntur ipſarum Scripturarum, quaſi non recte habeant, neque ſint ex authoritate, & quia variè ſint dictæ, & quia non poſſit ex his inveniri veritas ab his, qui neſciunt Traditionem. *L.* 3. *c.* 2.

(*r*) Si enim quod ab eis profertur, veritatis eſt Evangelium, diſſimile eſt autem hoc illis, quæ ab Apoſtolis nobis tradita ſunt; qui volunt, poſſunt diſcere, quemadmodum ex ipſis Scripturis oſtenditur, jam non eſſe id quod ab Apoſtolis traditum eſt veritatis Evangelium. *L.* 3. *c.* 11.

(*ſ*) Confutati ab iis, quæ in Scripturis de Chriſti adventu referuntur. *L.* 4. *c.* 69.

(*t*) Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem. *Adv. Hermog.* c. 22.

the

the Scripture. And disputing against * *Hermogenes* who would not allow the World to be created out of nothing, he objects to him, that he could find nothing of his Doctrine *in Scripture.* And thereupon challenges both himself and his Followers, to shew it if there be. And if they cannot, charges them to beware of the dreadful *Woe denounced against those who add to, or detract from* the Word of God. In like manner *Clemens Alexandrinus* lays it down as an undoubted Truth, that (*u*) *those must certainly err in the greatest Matters, who engage themselves in them, unless they keep to the Rule of Faith.* And says, (*w*) *If they had a Judgment between Truth and Falshood, exercised to make choice of what Things are proper, they would obey the Scriptures.* I confess, a little after he says (*x*) *He that kicks against the Tradition of the Church, and starts aside into the Opinions of Mens Heresies, ceases hereupon to be a Man of God, and faithful to the Lord.* But that by this Ecclesiastical Tradition he means not any Thing distinct from Scripture, he gives us in the next words to understand; affirming that *He that shall return from this deceit, and* HEAR-

---

* An autem de aliquâ subjacenti materiâ facta sint omnia, nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat væ illud, adjicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum. *Ibid.*

(*u*) Σφάλλεσθαι γὰρ ἀνάγκη μέγιστα τὰς μεγίστοις ἐγχειροῦντας πράγμασιν, ἢν μὴ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας παρ' αὐτῆς λαβόντες ἔχωσι τὸ ἀληθείας. *Strom.* l. 7. p. 890. *Edit. Oxon.*

(*w*) Εἰ γὰρ ἐκέκριντο, ταῖς θείαις ἐπιτάττοντο ἂν γραφαῖς. *Ibid.*

(*x*) Ἄνθρωπος εἶναι τῷ θεῷ καὶ πιστὸς τῷ κυρίῳ διαμένειν ἀπολώλεκεν, ὁ ἀναλακτίσας τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ παραδόσει, καὶ ἀνασκιρτήσας εἰς δόξας αἱρέσεων ἀνθρωπίνων· ὁ δὲ ἐκ τῆς δὲ τῆς ἀπάτης παλινδρομήσας, καταπαύσας τῶν γραφῶν, καὶ τὸν αὐτῷ βίον ἐπερείσας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, οἷον ἐξ ἀνθρώπου θεὸς ἀποτελεῖται. *Ibid.*

KEN

KEN TO THE SCRIPTURES, *and be converted to the Truth, is in a Manner of a Man become a God.* And again, (y) *We uſe the Scriptures, as the* Criterion, *to find out Things.* And a little after, (z) *We do not wait for the Teſtimony of Men, but prove that which is ſought after by the Voice of the Lord, which is more ſatisfactory than all Demonſtrations, or rather is the only Demonſtration; according to which Knowledge, they who have taſted of the Scripture are faithful. It is by the Words of God,* ſays *Origen* (a), *that the Spirit grows ſtrong, as the Fleſh does by Meats and Delights.* And more expreſly to our preſent purpoſe, at another time, ſpeaking of the two Teſtaments, (b) *In which,* ſays he, *every Word that belongs to God may be ſearched out and diſcuſſed, and the whole Knowledge of Things may be taken from them. But if any Thing remains undetermined by theſe Divine Writings, no other third Scripture may be received for our Inſtruction.* So ſays St. *Cyprian,* (c) *Whence is this Tradition, whether deſcending from the Authority of our Lord and*

(y) Ἀμέλει πρὸς τὴν τῶν γραμμάτων ἔυρεσιν, αὐτῇ [τῇ κυριακῇ γραφῇ] χρώμεθα κριτηρίῳ. *Ibid.*

(z) Οὐ τῶν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀναμένομεν μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ κυρίου φωνῇ πιστεύομεν τὸ ζητούμενον· ἣ πασῶν ἀποδείξεων ἐναργεστέρα, μᾶλλον δὲ, ἡ μόνη ἀπόδειξις ἔστα τυγχάνει. Καθ' ἣν ἐπιστήμην οἱ τῆς ἀπογευσάμενοι μόνον τῶν γραφῶν πιστοί. *Ibid.*

(a) Sicut cibis & deliciis caro, ita Spiritus verbis divinis convaleſcit. *In Levit.* Hom. ix. p. 80.

(b) In quibus liceat omne verbum quod ad Deum pertinet (hoc enim eſt ſacrificium) requiri & diſcuti, atque ex ipſis omnem rerum ſcientiam capi. Si quid autem ſuperfuerit, quod non divina ſcriptura decernat, nullam aliam tertiam ſcripturam debere ad auctoritatem ſcientiæ ſuſcipi. *Hom.* v. p. 66.

(c) Unde eſt iſta Traditio? utrum de Dominicâ & Evangelicâ auctoritate deſcendens, an de Apoſtolorum mandatis atque Epiſtolis veniens? Ea enim facienda eſſe quæ ſcripta ſunt, Deus teſtatur, & proponit ad Jeſum Nave, dicens: Non

 receder

and his Gospel, or comeing from the Precepts and Epistles of the Apostles. For God witnesses, that those Things are to be done which are written, and propounds it to Jesus *the Son of* Nave, *saying: The Book of this Law shall not depart out of thy Mouth, but thou shalt meditate in it Day and Night, that thou mayst observe to do all Things that are written in it. If therefore it be commanded in the Gospel, or be contained in the Epistles or Acts of the Apostles — let this divine and holy Tradition be observed. But if* the contrary be true, *how is it that they may seem not fit to be condemned by us, who appear by the Testimony of the Apostle to be condemned by themselves?* And in his Discourse *de Lapsis*, he complains of the Forwardness of the Martyrs, to grant Letters for a Reconcilation to Penitents not duly humbled, and professes to them, *(d) He is not joyned to the Church, who is separated from the Gospel.* And again he asks; *(e) Do the Martyrs order any Thing to be done? Yet if the Things they order are not written in the Law of the Lord, it is first to be inquired, whether they have obtained of God what they sued for. Then,* [but not till

---

recedet liber legis hujus ex ore tuo, sed meditaberis in eo die ac nocte, ut observes facere omnia quæ scripta sunt in eo.—Si ergo aut in Evangelio præcipitur, aut in Apostolorum Epistolis aut Actibus continetur, ut à quacunque hæresi venientes non baptizentur, sed tantum manus illis imponatur in pœnitentiam; observetur divina hæc & sancta Traditio. Si verò ubique hæretici nihil aliud quàm adversarii & antichristi nominantur: Si vitandi & perversi & à semet ipsis damnati pronunciantur; quale est ut videantur damnandi à nobis non esse, quos constat Apostolicâ contestatione à semet ipsis damnatos esse? *Epist.* 74. *Pompeio.*

(d) Nec Ecclesiæ jungitur, qui ab Evangelio separatur. *De Lapsis*, p. 129.

(e) Mandant aliquid Martyres fieri? Sed si scripta non sint in Domini lege quæ mandant; ante est ut sciamus illos à Deo impetrasse quod postulant; tunc facere quod imandant: neque enim statim videri potest de Divinâ Majestate concessum, quod fuerit humanâ pollicitatione promissum. *p.* 130.

till then] *what they order may be done.* And again, (*f*) He thinks it ſtrange, that *Cuſtom ſhould be thought greater than Truth, or that That ſhould not be followed in Spirituals, which has been revealed for our Improvement by the holy Spirit.* (*g*) *In our worldly Concerns,* ſays St. *Athanaſius, we will not mind a Multitude of Men under falſe Names; And in our heavenly Doctrines, ſhall I follow unſupported Motions, leaving the Things we have been taught of old and very long ago, with great Conſent, and with the Teſtimony of the Scriptures?* And writing to (*h*) *Dracontius* he puts him in Mind, that *the People expected to be fed by him, with Doctrine out of the holy Scriptures*; and tells *Marcellinus* (*i*) *that the Scripture is the Miſtreſs of Virtue and true Faith*; and poſitively affirms, that (*k*) *the holy and divinely inſpired Scriptures are ſufficient for the Declaration of the Truth.* And upon another Occaſion, having reckoned up the ſeveral Books of the Old and New Teſtament, he profeſſes (*l*) that *Theſe are the Wells of Salvation. In theſe only is the Doctrine of Godlineſs declared. Let no Man add any Thing to theſe, nor take any Thing from them.*

(*f*) Quaſi conſuetudo major ſit veritate, aut non id ſit in ſpiritualibus ſequendum, quod in melius fuerit à Sancto Spiritu revelatum. *Epiſt. Jubiano.* 73.

(*g*) Τίνων μὲν ἕνεκα πραγμάτων, ὐκ ἀιδησόμεθα πλῆθ Ψευδωνύμων· ὐρανίων δὲ χαειν δογμάτων, νεύμασιν ἀναποδείκτοις ἀκολυθήσω, τῆ πάλαι τε πρόπαλαι μετὰ πολλῆς συμφωνίας, τε τῆ γραφῶν μαρτυρίας παραδεδεγμένων ἀναχωρήσας. Quod veritas non multit. Judic.

(*h*) Ὁι λαοὶ προσδοκῶσι φέρηλά σε τροφὴν ἀυτοῖς, τὴν ἐκ τῆ γραφῶν διδασκαλίαν. Ad Dracont. Epiſt.

(*i*) Πᾶσα μὲν ἡ θεῖα γραφὴ διδάσκαλός ἐστιν ἀρετῆς τε πίστεως ἀληθὲς. Ad Marcellin. Epiſt.

(*k*) Αὐτάρκεις μὲν γὰρ εἰσιν αἱ ἁγίαι τε θεόπνευστοι γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τ ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν. Orat. c. Gentes. p. 1.

(*l*) Ταῦτα πηγαὶ σωτηρίε.—Ἐν τύτοις μόνοις τὸ τ ἐυσεβείας διδασκαλεῖον ἐυαγγελίζεται· μηδεὶς τύτοις ὀπιβαλλέτω· μηδὲ τύτων ἀφαιρείδω τι. Fragm. Epiſt. 39.

Optatus teaches that our Bleſſed Saviour whilſt he was upon Earth, gave in charge to his Apoſtles whatſoever was neceſſary for the time ; but that as an earthly Father when he apprehends himſelf about to leave the World, makes his Will, and executes it before Witneſſes, that ſo it may continue after he is gone, for the Prevention of ſuch Differences as might otherwiſe ariſe amongſt his Children ; or for quieting and putting an end to them if they do ariſe and get to any Head ; And if it ſo fall out that any Conteſts happen amongſt them, they do not conſult their Father's Tomb, but ſearch his Will, for reconciling them, and reſtoring Concord amongſt them, and ſo he who lies at reſt in his Grave, ſilently ſpeaks by his laſt Teſtament. In like manner as he proceeds, (*m*) *He that is alive and whoſe the Will* is, *is in Heaven. Let his Will and Pleaſure therefore be inquired after in his Goſpel.* Thus we ſee how conſtantly it is inculcated, that the only Method for diſcovering the right Way of Salvation, is a diligent Search and Inquiry into the holy Scriptures. And the ſame Direction is left us alſo by a great many others. In particular, *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* gives this Advice: (*n*) *Gather from the holy Scriptures at your leaſure a Summary of the Things contained therein. For the Subſtance of our Faith was not framed as it ſeemed good to Men, but the choiceſt Sayings collected out of the whole Scripture, make up one Doctrine of Faith.* And

(*m*) Vivus, is cujus eſt Teſtamentum, in cœlo eſt. Voluntas ejus, velut in Teſtamento, ſic in Evangelio inquiratur. *C. Parmen.* l. 3. c. 101.

(*n*) Ἐκδίχε δὲ καλὰ τὰ δέοντα καιρὸν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς θείων γραφῶν περὶ ἕκαστα τῆς ἐγκειμένων σύστασιν· ὃ γὰρ ὡς ἔδοξεν ἀνθρώποις σωρεύθη τὰ τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλ' ἐκ πάσης γραφῆς τὰ καιρικώτατα συλλεχθέντα μίαν ἀναπληροῖ τὴν τῆς πίστεως διδασκαλίαν. Catech. 5. c. 7.

it

it is, says St. *Basil*, (*o*) *a manifest falling from the Faith, and a great Instance of Pride, either to set aside any Thing of those that are written, or to introduce any of the Things that are not written:* As he had also said a little before, (*p*) *Now I thought it suitable to the common Design both ours and yours, to fulfil the Commandment of your Love in Christ, in the Simplicity of a sound Faith, by declaring what I have been taught from the divinely inspired Scriptures.* And presently after, (*q*) *Utterly rejecting as strange and foreign from our Holy Faith, all those Doctrines, which besides a foreign Manner of Expression, instill moreover into the Mind a foreign Sense of Things, and which we do not find to have been preached by Holy Men.* And again, (*r*) *If I speak of my self, hear me not. If I rehearse the Things that are written, yield to the Truth.* And yet again, (*s*) *Believe the Things that are written: Those that are not written, seek not.* And at another time more particularly and fully, (*t*) *All Scripture is*

(*o*) Φανερὰ ἔκπλωσις πίστεως, καὶ ὑπερηφανίας κατηγορία, ἢ ἀθετεῖν τι τῶν γεγραμμένων, ἢ ἐπεισυνεισάγειν τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων. De vera ac pia fide.

(*p*) Νῦν δὲ πρὸς τὸν κοινὸν ἡμῶν τε καὶ ὑμῶν σκοπὸν ἁρμόζον ἐλογισάμην, ἐν ἁπλότητι τῆς ὑγιαινούσης πίστεως, τὸ ἐπίταγμα τῆς ὑμετέρας ἐν Χριστῷ ἀγάπης πληρῶσαι, εἰπών, ἃ ἐδιδάχθην παρὰ τῶν θεοπνεύστων γραφῶν. *Ib d.*

(*q*) Ὅσα δὲ πρὸς τῷ ξένῳ τῆς λέξεως, ὅτι καὶ τὰ νῦν ξένον ἡμῖν ἐπεισάγει, καὶ οὐ ὄντα ἔστιν ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγίων κηρυσσόμενα εὑρεῖν, ταῦτα ὡς ξένα καὶ ἀλλότρια τῆς εὐσεβοῦς πίστεως πανταπασι παραιτούμεθα. *Ibid.*

(*r*) Εἰ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ λαλῶ, μὴ ἀκούσῃς μου· εἰ τὰ γεγραμμένα ἀναμιμνήσκω, ὑπείκων τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. Hom. 29. adverſ. calum. Trinit.

(*s*) Τοῖς γεγραμμένοις πίστευε, τὰ μὴ γεγραμμένα μὴ ζήτει. *Ibid.*

(*t*) Πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος καὶ ὠφέλιμος, διὰ τοῦτο συγγραφεῖσα παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, ἵν' ὥσπερ ἐν κοινῷ τῶν ψυχῶν ἰατρείῳ, πάντες ἄνθρωποι τὸ ἴαμα τῶν οἰκείων πάθους ἕκαστος ἐκλεγώμεθα, &c. Id. Hom. in Pſalm 1.

divinely

divinely inſpired and profitable, being written by the Spirit on purpoſe, that here, as in a common Hoſpital for Souls, every one may collect a Medicine for his own Paſſions, &c. And yet once more, (*u*) having asked, *What is the Property of a Believer?* He anſwers, *To give a full and firm Aſſent to the Power of thoſe Things that are ſpoken, without daring to detract from, or add to them. For if all that is not of Faith is Sin, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks; and Faith is by Hearing, and Hearing by the Word of God, all that is beſides the divinely inſpired Scriptures, being not of Faith, is Sin.* (*w*) *Gathering together from all Places the Teſtimonies of the Holy Scripture*, ſays *Epiphanius*. And having ſpoken of our Saviour's being the *Miniſter of Circumciſion for the Truth of God, that he might fulfil the Promiſes:* He ſubjoins, (*x*) *But that the Holy Spirit does miniſter together with him, we have learnt out of the Divine Writings.* (*y*) *The Courſe of Reading at preſent*, ſays St. *Ambroſe*, *Teaches that we muſt neither detract any Thing from the Divine Commandments, nor add to them.* And again he puts theſe Queſtions, (*z*) *Who will ſay any Thing, where the Scriptures ſay nothing?* (*a*) *How*

(*u*) Τὸ ἐν τοιαύτῃ πληροφορίᾳ συνδιαζῆσθαι τῇ δυνάμει τῇ εἰρημένῃ, καὶ μηδὲν τολμᾶν ἀθετεῖν, ἢ ἐπιδιαλάσσεσθαι. Εἰ γὰρ πᾶν, ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἁμαρτία ἐστίν, ὡς φησιν ὁ Ἀπόστολος, ἡ δὲ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς· ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος θεοῦ· πᾶν τὸ ἐκτὸς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς, οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ὄν, ἁμαρτία ἐστίν. Id. in Moral. Reg 80. c. 22.

(*w*) Πανταχόθεν συνάγοντες τὰ θείας γραφῆς τὰς μαρτυρίας. Anacorat. c. 64.

(*x*) Συνδιακονεῖν δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον συμπαρειλήφαμεν ἐκ θείων γραφῶν. c. 68.

(*y*) Docet igitur nos præſentis ſeries lectionis, neque detrahere aliquid divinis debere mandatis, neque addere. *B. Ambroſ.* de Paradiſo. c. 12.

(*z*) Sanctis ſcripturis non loquentibus, quis loquetur? *Id. de Vocat. Gent.* l. 2. c. 3.

(*a*) Quæ in Scripturis ſanctis non reperimus, ea quemadmodum uſurpare poſſumus? *Id. de Offic.* l. 1. c. 23.

ſhall

ſhall we make uſe of thoſe Things, which we find not in the Holy Scriptures? And treating of our Bleſſed Saviour, he delivers himſelf in this manner; (*b*) *I read that he is the firſt, I read that he is not the ſecond. Let them who ſay he is the ſecond, ſhew where they read it.* The next I ſhall name is *Vincentius Lirinenſis*, who lays down theſe two Rules, in order to the *Diſtinction of the Catholick Faith, from the Falſehood of Heretical Pravity, that it is to be made (c) firſt, by the Authority of the Divine Law; and then by the Tradition of the Catholick Church.* By the former, as the chief and proper Rule of our Faith, and by the other as a corroborating Evidence in divers Caſes, ſhewing the true Senſe of it. (*d*) *We have no ſuch Power*, ſays *Gregory Nyſſen*, *I mean of ſaying whatever we pleaſe, ſince we have uſed the Rule and Law of all Doctrine, the Holy Scripture. Whilſt we look this way, we neceſſarily receive that only which is conſonant to the Intention of thoſe Writings.* And a while after, (*e*) *We take it for granted, that That is fitter to beget Faith than all artificial Concluſions, which is proved from the Holy Doctrines*

(*b*) Lego quia primus eſt, lego quia non eſt ſecundus. Illi qui ſecundum aiunt, doceant lectione. *Id. de Inſtit. Virg.* c. 11.

(*c*) Primo ſcilicet divinæ legis authoritate; tum deinde Eccleſiæ catholicæ Traditione. *Commonit.* c. 1.

(*d*) Ἡμεῖς δὲ τ ἐξεσίας ἄμοιρεσι ταύτης ἐσμὲν, τ λέγειν φημὶ ἅπερ βελόμεθα, κανόνι παντὸς δόγματος κ νόμῳ κεχρημένοι τῇ ἁγίᾳ γραφῇ· ἀναγκαίως πρὸς ταῦτα βλέποντες, τοῦτο δεχόμεθα μόνον, ὅπερ ἂν ᾖ συμφωνῶν τῷ τῆ γεγραμμένων σκοπῷ. *Greg. Nyſſen.* de Anima & Reſurrectione, *p.* 200.

(*e*) Ἡμῖν δὲ πάντων τῶν τεχνικῶν συμπερασμάτων ἕξις πιστότερον εἶναι ὡμολογεῖτο, τὸ διὰ τ ἱερῶν τ γραφῆς διδασμάτων ἀναφαινόμενον. Ζητεῖν οἶμαι δεῖν δὴ τοῖς εἰρημένοις, εἰ ἢ θεόπνευστος διδασκαλία τέτοις συμφέρεται; ἢ δὲ κἂν τις ἀνθείποι, φησὶ, μὴ ἔχει ἐν τάτῳ μόνῳ τὴν ἀλήθειαν πιστέω, ᾧ σφραγὶς ἕπεσι τ γραφικῆς μαθησίας. *p.* 207.

of

of Scripture. I am ſatisfied that as to the Things that have been ſaid, our Buſineſs is to enquire, whether the divinely inſpired Doctrine concurrs with them? And *this*, ſays he, *let whoſoever will contradict, does not Truth conſiſt only in that, which has the Seal of the Teſtimony of Scripture?* Beſides the Paſſage already mentioned from St. *Jerome*, there are others alſo of the ſame Father, which ought not to be paſſed over in ſilence. In his Expoſition of St. *Matthew*, he profeſſes (*f*) that *what has not Authority from Scripture, is as eaſily deſpiſed as proved.* And writing againſt the *Montaniſts* (*g*) *Let them know*, ſays he, *that we do not ſo much reject all Prophecy; which was confirmed by our Lord's Paſſion, as that we receive not thoſe who agree not* [in their Prophecies] *with the Authority of the Old and new Scripture.* At another time, (*h*) *Give me an Example*, ſays he, *from Scripture.* And a little after, (*i*) *No One's Saying has ſuch an Authority as our Lord's Command.* And at another time, (*k*) *But thoſe Things, which They readily find and fancy, without any Authority or Teſtimony of the Scriptures, and as it were by means* [or under the falſe Notion] *of Apoſtolical Tradition, theſe the Sword of God*

(*f*) Hoc quia de ſcripturis non habet authoritatem, eadem facilitate contemnitur, quâ probatur. *B. Hieron. in* S. Matt. c. xxiii.

(*g*) Sciant, à nobis non tam Prophetiam repelli, quæ Domini eſt ſignata paſſione, quàm eos non recipi, qui cum Scripturæ veteris & novæ authoritate non congruant. *Epiſt.* 54. *ad Marcellam.*

(*h*) Da mihi exemplum de ſcripturis. In *Pſalm* 98.

(*i*) Non habet tantam authoritatem ſermo dicentis, quantam Domini præceptum. *Ibid.*

(*k*) Sed & alia, quæ abſque authoritate & teſtimoniis ſcripturarum, quaſi Traditione Apoſtolicâ ſponte reperiunt atq; confingunt, percutit gladius Dei. *Id. in Agge.* c. 1.

ſmites.

ſmites. And once more; (*l*) *It is good to ſubmit to our Betters, to obey them that are Perfect; and next* AFTER THE RULES OF THE SCRIPTURES, *to learn the Courſe of our Life from others.* St. *Auguſtin* having reckoned up the ſeveral Books of the Old and New Teſtament, ſubjoins, (*m*) *In all theſe Books they that fear God and are meekly pious ſeek the Will of God*; adding moreover that (*n*) *Amongſt the Things that are openly laid down in Scripture, all thoſe are to be found that contain the Faith, or Manners of living.* And he tells us, (*o*) *The City of God believes the holy Scriptures both Old and New, which we call Canonical, whence Faith it ſelf is conceived, whereby the juſt Man liveth.* So likewiſe Writing againſt the *Donatiſt Petilian*, he ſays, (*p*) *If any one, I will not ſay, if we, who are in no wiſe to be compared to him, who ſaid,* Though we; *but as he added in the following Words*; *Though an Angel from heaven ſhould preach to you, either concerning Chriſt, or his Church, or any other Thing belonging to our Faith or Life, beſides what ye have received in the legal and evangelical Scriptures, let him be Anathema.*

(*l*) Bonum eſt igitur obedire majoribus, parere perfectis; & poſt regulas Scripturarum, vitæ ſuæ tramitem ab aliis diſcere. *Id. ad Demetriad. de Virgin. ſervanda.*

(*m*) In his omnibus libris timentes Deum, & pietate manſueti quærunt voluntatem Dei. *B. Aug. de Doctr. Chriſtiana.* l. 2. c. 9.

(*n*) In his enim quæ apertè in Scripturâ poſita ſunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moreſque vivendi. *Ibid.*

(*o*) Credit etiam Scripturis ſanctis & veteribus & novis, quas Canonicas appellamus, unde fides ipſa concepta eſt, ex quâ juſtus vivit. *De Civ. Dei.* l. 19. c. 18.

(*p*) Sive de Chriſto, ſive de ejus Eccleſiâ, ſive de quacunque aliâ re, quæ pertinet ad fidem vitamque noſtram, non dicam nos, nequaquam comparandi ei qui dixit, Licet ſi nos, ſed omnino qui ſecutus adjecit, ſi Angelus de cœlo vobis annunciaverit, præterquàm quod in Scripturis legalibus & evangelicis accepiſtis, anathema ſit. *Cont. Liſ. Petil.* l. 3. c. 6.

And at another time, (q) *Neither are Catholick Biſhops to be concurred with, if they happen at any time to be ſo far deceived, as to think any thing againſt the Canonical Scriptures of God.* And again he teaches, that the Letters of Biſhops may be corrected by other Biſhops upon good Conſideration, and by the Authority of Councils, and the Decrees of Provincial or National Councils by ſuch as are general; and even General Councils may upon new Emergencies have their Canons altered or revoked by thoſe that come after them. But in the mean time, (r) *The holy Canonical Scripture of the Old and New Teſtament*, is of that Authority, that *there is no Room left for doubting or diſputing, whether whatſoever is found written in it be not true and right.* And again upon another Occaſion he exhorts to a diligent Study of holy Scripture, as the only proper Way to be fully inſtructed in the Myſteries of our Religion. (ſ) *Read therefore my Brethren the holy Scripture, read it that ye be not blind, and the Leaders of the blind. Read the holy Scripture, in which you will fully find what is to be ſtuck to, and what to be avoided. Read it becauſe it is found to be*

(q) Quia nec catholicis Epiſcopis conſentiendum eſt, ſicubi fortè falluntur, ut contra canonicas Dei Scripturas aliquid ſentiant. *Id. de Unit. Eccleſ.* c. 10.

(r) Quis autem neſciat ſanctam Scripturam Canonicam, tam veteris quàm novi Teſtamenti, certis ſuis terminis contineri, eamque omnibus poſterioribus Epiſcoporum litteris ita præponi, ut de illâ omnino dubitari & diſceptari non poſſit utrum verum, vel utrum rectum ſit, quicquid in eâ ſcriptum eſſe conſtiterit. *De Bapt. c. Donat.* l. 2. c. 3.

(ſ) Legite ergo fratres mei Scripturam ſacram, legite eam ne cœci ſitis, & duces cœcorum. Legite ſacram Scripturam in quâ quid tenendum, & quid fugiendum ſit plenè invenietis. Legite eam quia omni melle dulcior, omni pane ſuavior, omni vino hilarior invenitur, *&c. Ad fratres in eremo. Serm.* 38.

ſweeter

sweeter than all Honey, more pleasing to the Palate than all Bread, more chearing than all Wine. With a great deal more to the same effect. In a word, (*t*) *This is it which whosoever finds he will find Life, and receive Salvation from the Lord.* St. *Chrysostom* Prays and Beseeches the *Corinthians* that *not minding* (*u*) *what pleases this or that Man, they inquire of all Things from the Scriptures.* And upon those Words of our blessed Saviour, *Verily, verily, I say unto you, whosoever entreth not by the Door into the Sheepfold, but climbeth up another Way, the same is a Thief and a Robber,* he discourses thus, (*w*) *Behold the Signs of a Thief: First he enters not in boldly; and in the next place, not according to the Scriptures. For this is, Not by the Door.—He called the Scriptures the Door, for they bring us to God, and open the Knowledge of God. These make us Sheep: These protect us, and suffer not the Wolves to enter in.* Whereto agree the Words of St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, putting this Question, (*x*) *What the Divine Scripture has not said, how shall we receive, and reckon it among the Things that are true?* And those other of *Theodoret* Bishop of *Cyr*, with which I shall conclude; (*y*) *Our Business is not to seek after the*

(*t*) Hæc est, quam qui invenerit inveniet vitam, & hauriet salutem à Domino. *Ibid.*

(*u*) Παρακαλῶ καὶ δέομαι πάντων ὑμῶν ἀφέντες τί τῷ δεῖνι ἢ τῷ δεῖνι δοκεῖ περὶ τούτων, παρὰ τῶν γραφῶν ταῦτα ἅπαντα πυνθάνεσθε. *Hom.* 13. *in* 2 *Cor.*

(*w*) Ὅρα τὰ δείγματα τοῦ λῃστοῦ πρῶτον, ὅτι οὐ παῤῥησίᾳ εἰσέρχεται· δεύτερον, ὅτι οὐ κατὰ τὰς γραφάς· τοῦτο γὰρ ἔστι τὸ μὴ διὰ τῆς θύρας.—Θύραν τὰς γραφὰς ἐκάλεσεν· αὗται γὰρ ἡμᾶς προσάγουσι τῷ θεῷ, καὶ τὴν θεογνωσίαν ἀναίγουσιν. αὗται πρόβατα ποιοῦσιν, αὗται φυλάττουσι, καὶ τοὺς λύκους οὐκ ἀφιᾶσιν ἐπεισπηδᾶν. K. T. Λ. *B. Chrysost. in S.* Jo. x. 1.

(*x*) Ὃ δὲ οὐκ εἴρηκεν ἡ θεία γραφὴ, πῶς δὲ τρόπον παραδεξόμεθα, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀληθῶς ἔχουσι καταλογιόμεθα; *Glaphyr. in Gen.* l. 2.

(*y*) Οὐ δεῖ ζητεῖν τὰ σεσιγημένα, σπεύδειν δὲ τὰ γεγραμμένα. *In Genes. Qu.* 45.

Things that have been kept in Silence, but to ſtick to thoſe that are written. I forbear to proceed farther in this Argument. For it would be an endleſs Task to ſhew at large the ſingular Harmony, and Conſent of both ancient and latter Writers in this great and known Truth.

Here the Reader may ſee, we are invited to ſtudy the holy Scriptures, to keep to what is written, to ſtick to, obey, and be determined by the Scriptures; have them recommended to us, as the propereſt Teſt whereby to judge what is Orthodox and Right, and thoſe condemned who held them not ſufficient, without the Help of Tradition; are put in Mind of the heavy Woe denounced againſt ſuch as either add to, or detract from them; are taught that they are a ſufficient Guide in our Way to eternal Happineſs, and the Miſtreſs and only ſure Teacher of Virtue and true Faith; that they are the Wells of Salvation, and in them the Doctrine of Godlineſs is declared; that even Catholick Biſhops are not to be followed, if their Sentiments be not according to Scripture. That it is great Pride, and no leſs than a Falling from the Faith, not to content our ſelves with what is written; are cautioned againſt ſeeking after Things not written, againſt ſaying any Thing where the Scriptures ſay nothing, againſt ſetting up Traditions againſt Scripture; and have Life and Salvation promiſed to thoſe that prefer and faithfully adhere to what they find in Scripture. So that it is fully apparent, we have both Scripture and Tradition, an abundantly larger and more unqueſtionable Tradition; than can any way be pretended for the Mixture and other Uſages, ſo hotly contended for, for the Uſe of Scripture as the Rule left us by our Bleſſed Saviour, for our Guidance in all Caſes; and particularly in all the neceſſary and eſſential Branches of his Worſhip. And

And beſides this Cloud of Witneſſes in the ancient Church, we have the ſame great Truth aſſerted by many ſtill, and in particular by a very ingenious and learned Writer of our own, in a Diſcourſe very lately publiſhed; who againſt the Intruſion of Lay Perſons, in taking upon them to adminiſter the Sacraments in caſe of Neceſſity, argues thus, (z) *Where does the Scripture teach us that God will accept of ſuch Miniſtrations in Caſes of Neceſſity? Is there any Promiſe of God for it? If there is not, we have no Ground to believe it. For Faith is, and muſt be founded upon ſome Promiſe. For when* Chriſt *ſays*, He that believeth, and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved, *he plainly means, he that ſhall believe what He and his Apoſtles had, and ſhould preach as the Revealed Will of God; not what any one ſhould believe upon the Dictates of his own Phantaſy, or upon meer human Reaſon, without any Authority from the Word of God, whereon to ground his Belief. For* WHEN WE BUILD OUR HOPES UPON WHAT HAS NO FOUNDATION IN THE WORD OF GOD, *this is not* FAITH, *but* PRESUMPTION. *And the Scripture teaches, that there is no Faith, but what is derived from the Word of God. And the ſame Scriptures teach us that whatſoever is not of Faith is Sin.* And even our learned Author himſelf when treating of the holy Kiſs, *&c.* pleads, (a) that *Theſe Cuſtoms though mentioned in Scripture, are not mentioned as Commands and binding Rules for Practice*; and throws them aſide upon this Account. Then which, what can be a plainer Acknowledgment that in his Opinion, nothing leſs than a *Scripture Command and binding Rule for Practice*, can make any Thing a neceſſary Chriſtian Duty? Thus have we the Authority of the Scriptures taught from time to time, as the only

(z) Dr. Brett's *Divine Right of Epiſcopacy*, p. 61.
(a) *Defence*, p. 20.

Rule

Rule prescribed by our Blessed Lord, for the right Government of our Conversation; and which alone can be infallibly depended upon, for our Guidance in order to Salvation.

Which makes me justly wonder, that now at length we should be directed to have less Regard to our Blessed Saviour's Words, interpreted in their most natural and genuine Sense, than to the Traditions of such as have lived since, or even of the *Jewish Talmud*; or that any Practice should be proposed and urged, as of absolute Necessity in order to Salvation, that has neither Precept to enjoin it, nor Example to enforce it, in all the Word of God, seeing we have such a plentiful Cloud of Witnesses for the Authority of Scripture; and so besides its divine Original, have incomparably more and plainer Tradition for our Dependance upon it, than can possibly be brought for any human Tradition whatsoever. Nevertheless against this two Pleas are offered.

1. (*b*) *That Tradition stands recommended by Scripture it self, and they are not opposite and destructive of each other.*

2. (*c*) *That we our selves are forced to fly to it in some other Cases.* Each of which I am therefore to consider in this Place, before I proceed to my next Proposition. The former is,

1. *That Tradition stands recommended by Scripture it self; and that these two Conveyances are not opposite and destructive to each other, but only different Ways of publishing the Will of God.*

First, It is pleaded, that *Tradition stands recommended by Scripture it self.* And for the Proof of this three Passages in Scripture are appealed to. The first is St. *Paul*'s Command to the *Corinthians*,

(*b*) *Defence*, p. 18. (*c*) *Pag.* 15. &c.

1 Cor.

1 Cor. xi. 2. *To keep the Ordinances as he delivered them unto them.* In the *Greek* it is παραδόσεις, the *Traditions.* But then it is to be remembred, that the Word παραδόσεις, denotes Doctrines, and may be applied to such as are either written or unwritten. It signifies the same, that the *Greek* Philosophers termed δόγματα, and St. *Paul* διδαχὴν, or τύπον διδαχῆς, *Rom.* vi. 17. As is plain from the Use of the Verb παραδίδωμι in the Text now mentioned, and other Places of the New Testament. Here says the Apostle, *Ye have obeyed from the Heart that Form of Doctrine, which was delivered you*, according to our Translation. But in the Original it is εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε, in which ye have been instructed, or taught. So 1 *Cor.* xi. 23. *I received of the Lord,* ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, *that which I also delivered*, or taught *you, that the Lord Jesus the same Night in which he was betrayed took Bread.* So 1 *Cor.* xv. 3. *I delivered unto you*, that is, I taught you, *first of all that which I also received, that Christ died for our Sins, according to the Scriptures.* In like manner, St. *Jude* 3. *Beloved*, says that Apostle, *when I gave all Diligence to write unto you of the common Faith, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you, that ye should earnestly contend for the Faith which was once delivered to*, or taught, *the Saints* (*d*). So that nothing more can be meant by Traditions in these Places, but the Doctrines the Apostle had taught the Christians, whether by Writing, or Word of Mouth. And if no more be intended by the *Ordinances* here (*e*) referred to, I know no Occasion there

(*d*) In this Sense, the Word is used also by *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, *Gregory Nyssen*, and *Cyril* of *Alexandria*. Vid. *Cyril. Hieros.* Catech. V. Edit. Oxon. p. 75. And by *Justin Martyr*, Οὕτως βαπτίζει ὡς ὁ χριστὸς παρέδωκεν. *Apol.* 2. p. 98.

(*e*) *Defence*, p. 18.

is

is for any Diſpute about them. But yet it will never follow from hence, that the Scripture is not the Rule that we are ſtedfaſtly to adhere to, whenſoever any unſcriptural Tradition comes in competition with it. As for inſtance, when our Saviour makes not the leaſt Mention, of any thing more in his Euchariſtick Cup than the *Fruit of the Vine*, and yet humane Tradition is appealed to, for making a Mixture of Water, of which our Saviour ſays not a Tittle, as though it were as neceſſarily incumbent upon all Chriſtians, as the Wine it ſelf, of which he makes expreſs Mention: Here is a manifeſt Oppoſition between Scripture and Tradition, unleſs it can be allowed, that Water and no Water, or a Mixture and no Mixture, are one and the ſame Thing. And St. *Paul* does by no means teach that Scripture is here to ſubmit to Tradition, how extenſive ſoever.

The next Text produced in behalf of Tradition, is 2. *Theſſ.* ii. 15. *Therefore Brethren ſtand faſt and hold the Traditions you have been taught, whether by Word, or by our Epiſtle.* Which was the Apoſtle's Exhortation to the *Theſſalonians*, to ſtick faithfully to, and carefully retain and practiſe thoſe Doctrines of Chriſtianity which he had taught them, either by Word of Mouth when preſent with them, or by his Letters when at a Diſtance from them. But of what Service can this be now to any Traditions, or any Sort of Doctrine that does not appear to have been taught by the Apoſtles either of theſe ways?

The only remaining Text is 2 *Tim.* i. 13. *Hold faſt the Form of ſound Words, which thou haſt heard of me in Faith and Love, which is in Chriſt Jeſus.* Here *Timothy* is required to hold faſt the ſound Doctrine he had been taught by the Apoſtle, with a firm Faith, and a truly Chriſtian Affection,

fection, and brotherly Kindneſs towards all that ſtood in need of it. But I never expected to have had theſe Words preſſed in Favour of ſuch Practices, of which we find no Footſteps in the Apoſtolick Age, nor one Word is to be met with concerning them, in the Writings of this, or any other of the Apoſtles. How a *Form of Sound Words* taught by St *Paul*, can denote ſuch Practices as have nothing to be pleaded for them, but the Authority of ſuch as lived after the Apoſtles Death, is a Diſcovery I am not yet acquainted with. And how (*f*) *plain* ſo ever it may be in our learned Author's Opinion, every one elſe muſt needs ſee here is no Proof, that *if we be governed by Scripture, we muſt be governed by Tradition too*, at leaſt by any Sort of Tradition that never appeared till after the Apoſtolick Age, and cannot well be reconciled to Scripture.

But we are told farther, (*g*) that *theſe two Conveyances are not oppoſite, and deſtructive of each other, but only different Ways of publiſhing the Will of God, and only two Streams flowing from the ſame Fountain.* But now if they happen in ſome Inſtances to teach contrary Doctrines, as in the Caſe of the Mixture; if our Saviour teach one Thing, and Tradition is cited for another of a different Nature, what can hinder their being in this Caſe *oppoſite and deſtructive of each other*? What if the Scripture ſay nothing of Prayer for the Dead, can an after Tradition, make that a neceſſary Duty for all Chriſtians? And if it can, is not here ſome Oppoſition between them, and ſuch as is deſtructive of the Directions given us to ſtick to Scripture, as of it ſelf ſufficient (*h*) to lead us to Salvation? What if our Saviour only enjoyn us to offer up

(*f*) *Defence*, p. 19. (*g*) Pag. 18. (*h*) 2 *Tim.* iii. 16, 17.

 our

our euchariſtical Sacrifice, according to his own Inſtitution, and yet Tradition is produced to prove this not ſufficient, but it muſt be done in a certain unſcriptural Form, or elſe it is no Sacrament? Is not here an Oppoſition again, and ſuch as, if not deſtructive of the Inſtitution, is yet no way neceſſary to make it compleat for the great End whereto it was deſigned? Theſe Inſtances ſhew, that Scripture and Tradition are not always agreed upon, for conveying the ſame Truth, but may in divers Caſes be *oppoſite and deſtructive of each other*. And whenſoever this happens, I do not meet with any Thing here offered, which can paſs for a Proof, that the latter *Way of Conveyance* is moſt authentick, and rather to be relied upon than Scripture. And ſo I proceed to the other Plea alledged in behalf of Tradition. That,

2. *We our ſelves are forced to fly to it in ſome other Caſes*; and amongſt others in theſe following.

1. The Caſe of *Infant Baptiſm*. For (*i*) *which way can we prove the Neceſſity, or indeed the Lawfulneſs of it, without the Help of Jewiſh and Chriſtian Tradition?* In Anſwer hereto, it is obſervable, that this Practice has no Oppoſition to any part of Scripture, as the Neceſſity of the Mixture now under debate has; and ſo no Ground appears for queſtioning the Lawfulneſs of it. Beſides, that Scripture aſſures us, that Children, were not only allowed, but ſtrictly (*k*) required to be entered into Covenant with God under the old Law, and are certainly as capable of being admitted into Covenant with him now as they were then,

(*i*) *Defence*, p. 15.
(*k*) *Gen.* xvii. 12. Levit. xii. 3. St. *Luk.* ii. 21.

and

and (*l*) whole Houſes were baptized, in which it is hardly to be ſuppoſed there ſhould be no Children, which is abundantly enough to ſhew their Baptiſm lawful. And then as to the Neceſſity of it, not only our Bleſſed Saviour (*m*) gave Commiſſion for *Baptizing all Nations*, of which Children are undoubtedly a Part, but the Apoſtle St. *Paul* having taught us, that amongſt Chriſtians, (*n*) Baptiſm ſucceeded in the Room of Circumciſion, it is a natural Inference, that Children not being excepted, and being withal now as capable of Baptiſm, as they had been before of Circumciſion, here is therefore a good Foundation for Pædo-Baptiſm in Scripture. Eſpecially if hereto be added what St. *Paul* ſays to this purpoſe, 1 *Cor.* vii. 14. But to this Text our Author objects, that (*o*) *the Meaning of it is expounded to different Senſes not only by our modern* Antipædo-baptiſts, *but by* Tertullian, *and ſome other ancient Writers.* But he does not ſay, that the moſt and beſt Expoſitors do not ordinarily interpret the Words in favour of Infant-Baptiſm. Though withal it is readily owned, that the Practice of the Church ſince is a good corroborating Evidence, and makes the Neceſſity of it more apparent and unqueſtionable, than it might otherwiſe have been. However, here is ſomething more *to warrant the Practice, and juſtifie the Neceſſity, than barely primitive Uſage, and conſentient Tradition.* The Summ is, that our Saviour commanded all Nations to be baptized; and ſo the only Enquiry here is, whether Children be included in this Expreſſion. That they are ſo, is rightly collected from their being taken into Covenant with God, before our Saviour's Incar-

---

(*l*) *Acts* xvi. 15 & 33. 1 *Cor.* i. 16. (*m*) St. *Matt.* xxviii. 19. (*n*) *Coloſſ.* ii. 11, 12. (*o*) *Defence*, p. 6.

nation, and other Paſſages in Scripture. So that all that Tradition has to do in this Caſe, is only to come in as a collateral ſubſidiary Evidence; but by no means to inſtitute a new unſcriptural Duty.

2. The Caſe (*p*) of the *Lord's Day*. For *upon what Grounds is the keeping Sunday inſtead of* Saturday *defenſible? The Scripture*, ſays our learned Author, *has nothing determining: The Apoſtles have left us no Command for Tranſlating the Feſtival, from the Seventh to the Firſt Day*. And yet I cannot but think we have conſiderable Authority for this from Scripture, though not ſo clear and ſtrong without the Aſſiſtance of Tradition, as with it. Our Saviour (*q*) rebuked the Phariſees for their over zealous Obſervation of their Sabbath, telling them moreover that (*r*) *the Son of man is Lord alſo of the Sabbath*; and ſo could dispenſe with that, or wholly aboliſh and lay it aſide, as he pleaſed. And that the Firſt day of the Week ſhould be preferred before it is fairly intimated in our Saviour's chooſing to riſe from the dead on that Day. Which being an Occaſion of infinitely greater Joy and Comfort to his Diſciples than any before him could have from the Bleſſing of the Seventh day, whether upon Account of the Creation of the World, or the Deliverance of the *Iſraelites* out of *Egypt*, was a very reaſonable Foundation for the Obſervation of that Day amongſt Chriſtians. And a yet farther ineſtimable Bleſſing on that Day, on the Feaſt of Pentecoſt, I mean (*ſ*) the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt upon the Apo-

(*p*) *Defence*, p. 16.
(*q*) St. *Mark* ii. 25.
(*r*) *Verſe* 28.
(*ſ*) *Acts* ii. 1, &c.

ſtles

ſtles aſſembled at *Jeruſalem* might ſtill be a farther Inducement to the peculiar Obſervation of this Day, which had brought ſo great Good to Mankind. And indeed what Day could poſſibly be thought fitter for the Chriſtian Worſhip, than that wherein the whole Myſtery of our Redemption was compleated, wherein our Saviour who had *died for our Sins*, *roſe* (*t*) *again* alſo from the Dead *for our Juſtification?* And wherein alſo the Holy Spirit was ſo wonderfully conferred upon the Apoſtles, to qualify them for the great Work of Preaching the Goſpel, and converting the World, whereto they were appointed? Though I confeſs, it was the former of theſe Bleſſings that diſſolved the *Jewiſh* Oeconomy, and introduced the Obſervation of the firſt Day of the Week. For ſo we read, (*u*) That *on the firſt Day of the Week the Diſciples were aſſembled*, but privately, *for fear of the Jews*, *and with their Doors ſhut*, when our Lord came unexpectedly, *and ſtood in the midſt of them*, wiſhing them *Peace*, and *ſhewing them his Hands and his Side.* (*w*) *And after eight Days again*, that is on the next firſt Day, *his Diſciples were within*, *and Thomas with them*, when our Saviour gave him all the Satisfaction he had deſired, concerning the Truth of his Reſurrection. The next Day of their Aſſembly we meet with in Scripture was the great Day of Pentecoſt, but juſt now mentioned, and it were eaſy to ſhew, that this was not on the ſeventh but the firſt Day. After this we find, That (*x*) *upon the firſt Day of the Week*, *the Diſciples came together*, at *Troas*, *to break Bread*, that is, to worſhip God, and more eſpecially to celebrate the Holy Euchariſt. And

---

(*t*) *Rom.* iv. 25. (*u*) St. *Joh.* xx. 19. (*w*) *Ver.* 26. (*x*) *Acts* xx. 7.

again,

again, the Apoſtle St. *Paul* writing to the *Corinthians*, (*y*) directs them to make Collections for the Relief of ſuch as were in want of their Aſſiſtance, and that this ſhould be done on the firſt Day of the Week, as being the known Time of their ſolemn religious Aſſemblies. Nor was this any Uſage peculiar to the *Corinthians*, but what was practiſed in other diſtant Places likewiſe, as is plain from the Orders he had ſent to the Diſciples at *Galatia*. For ſo ſays the Apoſtle, *Concerning the Collections for the Saints, as I have given Order to the Churches of Galatia, even ſo do ye. Upon the firſt Day of the Week, let every one of you lay by him in ſtore*, &c. Whereto, if we add St. *John*'s Declaration (*z*), *That he was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day*, the Day peculiarly appointed for the Service and Worſhip of our Bleſſed Lord, I cannot but think that we have here conſiderable Authority for the Obſervation of the firſt rather than the ſeventh Day. It is true, *the Apoſtles*, as our learned Author notes (*a*), *were daily in the Temple, and went into the Synagogues, and Preached on the Sabbath*, taking all Opportunities they could to meet with, and inſtruct and convert the *Jews*. But this will by no means ſhew, that when they aſſembled with the Chriſtians, this was not principally on the Lord's Day. So that here we do not depend ſolely upon unſcriptural Tradition, for the Change of the Day, but are led to it even by the Scriptures themſelves. Let but ſuch Evidence as this be brought for any of the Points now contended for, and we will never oppoſe the Uſe of them.

3. The Caſe of the *Holy Scriptures* themſelves. *'Tis from Tradition*, ſays our learned Author (*b*),

---

(*y*) 1 *Cor.* xvi. 1, 2. (*z*) *Rev.* i. 10. (*a*) *Defence*, p. 16. (*b*) *Pag.* 17.

we are assured that the Books of the old and new Testament are Divine Revelation. —— We believe the Books of the new Testament are inspired Writings, because those who were contemporary with the Apostles, those who lived with such Contemporaries, and all succeeding Ages, have received them as such. Either we must rest the Motives of Credibility upon human Testimony, or lie open to the Delusion of a private Spirit. And thus we shall either wander through Enthusiasm, or want a new Inspiration to prove the old one. Which Assertions, together with others to the like Purpose, look as if no Proof of the Divinity of Scripture were to be hoped for any other way, than meerly by human Tradition. And again he positively affirms, (*c*) *There is nothing in Scripture, to prove Scripture.* In direct Contradiction to one of his own Fathers, *Clemens Alexandrinus* professing that (*d*) the Scriptures are a demonstrative Proof of themselves. And yet whosoever sets himself seriously to study those Sacred Writings, will soon discover they oftentimes bear Witness to themselves; and at other Times one Part or Book of Scripture bears Witness to another. Most of the Books of the old Testament tell who were their Authors, and what Commission they had for the Messages and Doctrines they delivered: And the new Testament also bears Witness for them, that they were written by no less than (*e*) a Divine Inspiration, and for the general Good of the Church. And again, we are taught that (*f*) *no Scripture is* ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως, (*g*) *of Mens own Motion*, or setting out: *For the Pro-*

(*c*) *Page* 45. (*d*) Οὕτως ἔν γε ἡμεῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν περὶ αὐτῶν τῶν γεγραμμένων τελείως ἀποδεικνύντες ἐκ πίστεως πιστούμεθα ἀποδεικτικῶς. *Strom.* 7. *p.* 891. *Edit. Oxon.*

(*e*) 2 *Tim.* iii. 16. (*f*) 2 *Pet.* i. 19, 20. (*g*) *See* Dr. Hammond *on the Words.*

phecy

phecy came not of old Time by the Will of Man: but holy men of God ſpake, as they were moved by the Holy Ghoſt. Add hereto the Miracles, wherewith they declare themſelves atteſted; the Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt for *opening our Underſtanding, that we may underſtand them*, as (*b*) our Saviour did thoſe of the Apoſtles, when aſſembled at *Jeruſalem*; together with the Uſe of natural Reaſon for inquiring into, and judging of the Credibility of the Evidence offered in their Favour; the Completion of the Predictions of thoſe from whom they came, and more eſpecially as to the Diſperſion of the *Jews*, and the wonderful Progreſs of Chriſtianity, the Effects of both which we now ſee in our own Days; the admirable Harmony and Concord there is in theſe holy Writings, tho' writ at very diſtant Times, and by Perſons of very different Educations, Employments and Intereſts, in the World; the Excellency of the Doctrines contained in them, as worthy of the God of Heaven to reveal them, and their ſingular Uſefulneſs for proclaiming the Honour and Glory of God, declaring his Power, ſhewing forth his Goodneſs and exalting his Praiſe; and then in relation to ourſelves, for informing our Minds, correcting our Wills, amending our Lives, eſtabliſhing our Faith; and in a Word, for both preparing us for, and entituling us to a better State, againſt we ſhall be taken hence. And whoſoever puts all theſe Teſtimonies for the Divine Inſpiration of Scripture together, cannot but ſee that it is not only (*i*) *Church Authority, which brings Evidence for this Revelation, and enables us to diſtinguiſh between the inſpired Writings, and human Compoſitions*, but that we have many other very

(*b*) St. *Luke* xxiv. 45. (*i*) *Defence, p.* 17.

material

material Witneſſes, beſides Tradition: And that there is no Occaſion for us, *either to reject the Motives of Credibility upon human Teſtimony, or to lie open to the Deluſion of a private Spirit*, as is here ſuggeſted. And yet this is not all; for if we were to appeal barely to Tradition, the Tradition in behalf of the Divine Inſpiration of Scripture, is not only avowed as I have ſhewn, and might have done it much more fully, by the Chriſtians themſelves, profeſſing pleading and contending for it; but even their moſt inveterate Enemies, ſuch as *Celſus*, and *Julian*, bare ſome Sort of Teſtimony to it, whilſt they ſought for Arguments from Scripture, whereby to undermine the Apologiſts for Chriſtianity: As alſo ſeveral Matters of Fact contained in Scripture were acknowledged by them for true. *The Authors*, as Biſhop *Ward* notes, (*n*) *were owned by* Julian; *the Miracles confeſſed, by* Celſus; *the checking of the Operation of the Devil, by* Porphyrius; *the Darkneſs and Earthquake at the Death of Chriſt, by* Thallus *and* Phlegon Trallianus; *the Crucifixion of Chriſt*, (*by* Pilate *under* Tiberius) *by* Tacitus. Not to mention the Teſtimony born to *Noah*'s Flood by the Poets; and more particularly by (*o*) *Ovid*, (*p*) *Virgil*, (*q*) *Horace*, and (*r*) *Juvenal*; as likewiſe by (*s*) *Lucian*, and (*t*) *Plutarch*; and the Deſtruction of *Sodom* and *Gomorrah* by (*u*) *Strabo*, (*x*) *Tacitus* and (*y*) *Solinus*. So that the Tradition for Scripture is ſo abundantly both fuller and more extenſive than can be pretended in behalf of the Uſages now under debate, that there is no pretence for a compariſon between them. Wherefore to con-

(*n*) *Sermon againſt Antiſcripturiſts.* (*o*) Metamorph. l. 1.
(*p*) Georg. l. 1. (*q*) Carm. l. 1. Od. 2. (*r*) Sat. 1.
(*s*) De Deâ Syr. (*t*) De Solert. animal. (*u*) Lib. 16.
(*x*) Hiſtor. l. 5. (*y*) Polyhiſtor. c. 48.

 clude

clude this Point; since not only the Tradition in behalf of the Scripture, is incomparably beyond that for the *Mixture*, *Prayer for the Dead*, &c but we have besides, divers other weighty Considerations, and which deserve to be well attended to as of great Use, for evincing the Divine Inspiration of these Sacred Writings; I am not yet able to discover whence it is, that (z) *could we succeed against the Force of* our learned Author's *Tradition, the Issue of the Victory would prove any way unhappy*, much less that it would be *very unhappy*; or that it would in the least degree *shake the main Pillars, and sap the Foundations of Religion*, as he is pleased to express himself. For by what has been said, it is very plain, that these Instances are in no wise parallel (a). On the contrary, to take in Tradition as an Assistant only, and to depend upon the written Word, as our sure Foundation, is the only way to have our Superstructure firm and durable, like a House built upon a Rock. Here we may securely stand our Ground, without Fear or Danger; whilst those who take Tradition for their Rule, and leave the Scriptures to follow its imperfect Light, are liable to be always in Motion, and never know where to stop, or what will at last become of them. Yet after all, I deny not, but we are indebted to Tradition for our Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures; but in such a Sense as will never prove that Tradition is to be preferred to Scripture, or that we are to learn our Du-

---

(z) *Defence*, p 17. (a) *If the Reader desire to inform himself more fully as to this Argument, about the Divine Authority of Scripture, he may please to consult Archbishop* Laud's *Conference with* Fisher *the* Jesuit, *Sect.* 16*th*, I did never love too curious a Search, *&c. and so on to the End of that long Section, where he will find it most judiciously and learnedly discussed; and I doubt not, to his full Satisfaction.*

ty

ty from any other Code of Laws, than that of Scripture. Tradition indeed conveys down to us the Books of Scripture, as it does thoſe of *Homer* or *Virgil*, *Demoſthenes* or *Tully*, or other Authors; and ſo it ſerves as a Deliverer of thoſe Laws we are to be governed by, and not as being itſelf our Law; as may appear by a familiar and obvious Inſtance. The City of *London* is ſettled by virtue of a royal Charter; which Charter is deſcended to the preſent Rulers of the City by Tradition. Yet if any Diſpute ariſe concerning its Priviledges, Recourſe for compoſing this is not to be had to the conveying Tradition, but to the Charter conveyed by it, to ſee the Nature and Importance of the Grant, and what Rights or Liberties it inveſts them in. In like manner the Deeds of an Eſtate are tranſmitted from one Generation to another by Tradition; yet this makes it not at all the leſs neceſſary to apply to thoſe Deeds in Caſe of any Suit, or Sale. And he that in ſuch a Caſe ſhould lay aſide his Writings, and tell his Lawyer, or Purchaſer, that he has Tradition for the Conditions of holding his Eſtate, will egregiouſly expoſe himſelf by it. Thus in Matters of Religion, when we have had the Inſtrument of our Chriſtian Charter delivered down to us, it is from that we muſt ſeek our Information concerning the Promiſe contained in it, and the Duties required by it, and muſt reckon our ſelves obliged carefully to obſerve its Rules and Directions, and in no Caſe to ſet up any Tradition, as rather to be attended to. I ſhall conclude this Argument with our Saviour's ſevere Reprehenſion to the Scribes and Phariſees; but which deſerves alſo to be ſeriouſly attended to by all, who like them, plead Tradition for making ſuch their Doctrines or Practices neceſſary to Salvation, as our Lord himſelf in Scripture has not made ſo. S. *Mar.* vii. 7.

In vain do they worſhip me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.

Thus having briefly ſhewn, the Advantage Scripture has above Tradition, whenſoever any Competition happens between them; and having thereby ſubverted the Foundations of the Alterations ſo zealouſly contended for, I might have ſtop'd here, as concluding they muſt neceſſarily fall of Courſe, and every one may ſee they muſt. But however to make the Matter yet more plain, I proceed to enquire concerning the Four controverted Articles, and to ſhew that,

II. The Tradition for them is not ſo full and unqueſtionable as it is repreſented to be. And if upon Examination they ſhall be found Defective here alſo, if not only bare Tradition be an incompetent Medium, for proving any Uſage eſſentially neceſſary in order to Salvation, though ever ſo fully and clearly recommended by it, but the Traditions for theſe Uſages come ſhort of the Evidence they are declared to have in them; a Man muſt be miſerably regardleſs of his own Salvation, before he will venture it upon ſuch unequal Terms as theſe. Yet that this and no better is really the Caſe before us, I am now to prove.

And here I begin with,

I. The Mixture of Water with the Wine in the ſacramental Cup. Of which I have theſe Two Things to ſay.

1. The Tradition for it is not ſo Extenſive as is pretended.

2. Where it does extend, it is not ſo full and ſatisfactory as it is given out to be.

1. This Tradition is not ſo Extenſive as is pretended. It is ſaid to be (*b*) *Early, General and Uninterrupted.* But what a Condition will it be in,

(*b*) *Defence, p.* 19.

if

if it fail in each of these Particulars? Yet that it does so, is no difficult Matter to shew.

And first, as to its Antiquity: I do not deny but it is Ancient, but only I look upon it as a great Failure that it is not old enough, at least it does not any way appear to be so. For there is no one Authority so much as pretended to be brought for it, during the Apostolical Age, whose Tradition would have been most Authentick, and have had much greater Deference paid to it, than to any, or even to all those that follow after. This our learned Author does not in the least dispute. (*c*) He tells us most truly, that the Apologies of *Quadratus* and *Aristides* are lost, and therefore *Justin Martyr* is the first Father, *who gives an Account of the Christian Worship.* These the Reader may observe were all Writers of the Second Century. And can there possibly be a franker Concession, that there is no Evidence for the *Mixture* from any Author of the first Age, than that the First who mentions it lived not till after that Time. But (*d*) is not *Justin Martyr early enough*, says our Author? No certainly, not to speak for the first Century, since he flourished not till about the Middle of the next Age; as I shall observe in its proper Place. But perhaps it may be said we have very few Writers of that Age, and their Works being short, they might easily not mention it. Be it so as to the others, yet we have the Writings of the new Testament, which could not have been expected to pass over this Usage in Silence, had it been then known to be a Part of our Saviour's Institution. And since neither these, nor any other, for that Age does so much as once mention it, I must conclude, we have no Testimony for it in the first Age, and so it is not old enough.

(*c*) *Defence*, *p.* 3. (*d*) *Page* 2.

2*dly*,

2*dly*, Neither was this Uſage ſo *General*, I mean ſo Univerſal, as it is pretended to be. How early ſoever it were, I have obſerved, it had no Evidence for it in the firſt Age, and ſo not from the Beginning. And now I add, that the Evidence cited for it in the following Ages, lived for ſome conſiderable Time, in no great Part of the World. For it is to be noted, that during the firſt Three Hundred Years, there being only Four Witneſſes produced for it; one in *Paleſtine*, one in *France*, another in *Egypt*, and another at *Carthage*, it will be hard to collect, as an undoubted Truth, from theſe, that it was conſtanly uſed in other Parts, at a great diſtance from them, of which they make no mention. This I ſay, ſuppoſing their Evidence to anſwer our Author's Expectation in other Reſpects. But if it does not anſwer, as I ſhall preſently ſhew it does not, then here is ſtill leſs Proof of the General Uſe of this Mixture. And if there be no Proof of a *General* Uſe of the *Mixture*, we may be very ſure there is none for the Univerſal Belief of the Neceſſity of it. For we are not preſently to conclude, from our hearing nothing of it, either for, or againſt it, from other Places, that they had all our Author's Notion of it. This is by no means a Proof that they all concurred in the Reception of it, or eſpecially that they all held it neceſſary, but rather that they knew nothing of it. I am ſure he muſt prove this to have been their Sentiment, by good and ſubſtantial Witneſs, before he can take it for granted, that they unanimouſly concurred with him in that they ſay nothing of. And inaſmuch as ſuch Witneſs is not to be produc'd, it unqueſtionably follows that it can no way be ſhewn to have been Univerſally held neceſſary: Nor is their Silence in the Caſe an Argument for their Reception of theſe Practices, any more than it is for Tranſub-

ſubſtantiation, that it was the known Doctrine of the Church from the Beginning, becauſe there were no Diſputes about it in the Primitive Times, before it had ever been thought of.

Again, 3*dly*, If a contrary Practice or Perſwaſion can be ſhewn to have prevailed in a conſiderable Part of Chriſtendom, then this Uſage cannot be ſaid to have been *Uninterrupted:* And this likewiſe is too Evident to be denied. *Tertullian* profeſſes very plainly (*e*) that it was *Wine that our Saviour conſecrated for the Commemoration of his Blood.* And even St. *Cyprian*, who is ſaid by our learned Author to be (*f*) DECISIVE in behalf of the Mixture, yet acknowledges all Biſhops of his Days (*g*) did not hold this Tradition; and grants both himſelf and ſome of his Predeceſſors, not to have uſed the *Mixture* contended for. (*h*) *If any*, ſays he, *of our Predeceſſors, either ignorantly, or ſimply, has not obſerved or kept, what our Lord taught us by his Example and Authority, Pardon may be granted by the Compaſſion of God to his Simplicity; but we cannot hope for the like Forgiveneſs, who are now admoniſhed and taught by the Lord, to offer the Lord's Cup mixed with Wine, as our Lord himſelf offered.*

Hence it appears, that this Tradition of the MIXTURE could not be fixed univerſally in the Days of this great Father; becauſe his Predeceſſors could not have been ignorant of it if it had.

(*e*) Vini---quod in ſanguinis ſui memoriam conſecravit. *De Anima. c.* 17. (*f*) *Reaſons, p.* 4. (*g*) Quanquam ſciam, frater cariſſime, Epiſcopos plurimos ----- Evangelicæ veritatis ac Dominicæ traditionis tenere rationem. *Epiſt.* 63. *Cæcil. p.* 156. (*h*) Siquis de anteceſſoribus noſtris, vel ignoranter vel ſimpliciter non hoc obſervavit & tenuit, quod nos Dominus facere exemplo vel magiſterio ſuo docuit; poteſt ſimplicitati ejus de indulgentia Domini venia concedi; nobis vero non poterit ignoſci, qui *nunc* à Deo admoniti & inſtructi ſumus, ut calicem Dominicum vino mixtum, ſecundum quod Dominus obtulit, offeramus, *p.* 156.

And

And that he says, but Now *we are admonished and instructed by God*, is a plain Intimation that this Tradition was new to them, and that they had not been acquainted with it before. And accordingly in the next Words, he adds, (*i*) *And of this let us write to our fellow Bishops, that so the evangelical Law and our Lord's Tradition may be observed* EVERY WHERE. So that it seems this Tradition was not yet of universal Observation, since otherwise he would not have needed to write that it might be so for the future. And once more, (*k*) *Giving Thanks, that whilst he instructs us for the future, he forgives us as to the Time past, what we have simply erred in* Whereas there could be no need, either of such Instruction for the future, or of such Forgiveness as to what was past, if the Observation of the Mixture had been always used, and by all. From which several Passages of this Father, any one may observe, the main *Decisive* Witness for the Mixture, is an undeniable Evidence against the Constancy and Universality of it. His Predecessors had not all observed it, and it was not till *Now*, that he and his Collegues were *admonished and taught it*, and that he would write to have it observed *every where*. I grant now that he had espoused it, he blames the Neglect of it and hopes to have it pardoned, in consideration that they did not know of it before. But nothing can be a plainer Proof than this, that it had not universally obtained till then, and particularly not in *Africk*, where this Father lived. If it be objected, that his Complaint was that they used Water only in the

---

(*i*) De hoc quoque ad Collegas nostros literas dirigamus, ut *ubique* lex evangelica & Traditio Dominica servetur. *Ibid.*

(*k*) Agentes gratias quod dum instruit in futurum quid facere debeamus, de præterito ignoscit quod simpliciter erravimus. *Ibid.*

Sacra-

Sacrament, and ſo were juſtly to be blamed for it. This does not at all affect my Cauſe, who do not pretend to juſtify their Conduct, but only to ſhew in Fact what their Practice was. And every one muſt yield that *pure Water* is no more a Mixture, than *pure Wine* is. At the ſame Time, with this Father lived *Origen*, though the elder of the Two, and he declares himſelf openly againſt any Neceſſity of a Mixture. For ſpeaking of our Saviour's Inſtitution of the Sacrament, he flatly denies his Uſe of a mix'd Cup. (*l*) He not only has theſe Words, not to be anſwered by our Author, οὐχ ὅτι ἐκέρασε, *not that he mix'd his Wine:* But more expreſly a little after, (*m*) *Jeſus when he entertains his Diſciples, entertains them,* ἀκεράτῳ, *with unmix'd Wine,* (in *Joannes Exiguus*'s Edition *Meraco*, with *pure Wine*;) *for he ſaith unto them, Take Drink, this is my Blood, that is ſhed for you for the Remiſſion of Sins, do this, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me.* † Bibe [illegible] Patrum. pag. 1.

And then as to the *Greek* Church, *Balſamon* in his Comment upon the Council in *Trullo* gives ſuch an Account of their Euchariſtick Cup, as will not conſiſt with the Mixture recommended to us. For he tells us, (*n*) they put warm Water into the conſecrated Cup. For which I am perſwaded our learned Author would be as ready to blame them as the *Latines*, (who *Balſamon* owns were diſſatiſfied with them for it) as not agreeable to the Method of Adminiſtring now (*o*) required and preſſed, as Eſſential to the Sacrament. Which ſhews the Mixture inſiſted upon is not of ſuch *uninterrupted*

(*l*) In Jeremi. hom. 12. (*m*) Ὁ Ἰησοῦς γὰρ εὐφραίνων τὰς μαθητὰς ἀκεράτῳ εὐφραίνει, ᾗ γὰρ λέγει αὐτοῖς λάβετε, πίετε, τοῦτό μου ἔστι τὸ αἷμα, &c. Ibid. (*n*) Οἱ λατῖνοι αἰτιῶνται τὴν εἰς τὸ ἅγιον ποτήριον τοῦ ζέοντος εἰσβολήν, &c. *In Can.* 32. (*o*) *Defence*, p. 50.

Practice, nor the Manner of using it so constantly observed as some might fancy it to be. Agreeably whereto, St. *Chrysostom* also professes against some who were for the Use of Water in the Sacrament, that our Saviour (p) *when he delivered the Mysteries, delivered Wine*, such as the Vine produces: And I hope he may pass for a good Witness. It is true, his Liturgy, and St. *Basil*'s are both cited (q) for the Proof of the Mixture; but how they will be of any service to this Cause will not be easily shewn. St. *Basil*, as far as I remember, for I have not *Goar* by me, has not a Word to the Purpose, but only (r) κεράσας, which our Author takes to mean that our Saviour *mingled* a Cup for the Eucharist. But whether this be necessarily the Sense of that Word, and might not to all Intents and Purposes, as properly import, that he only had prepared a Cup by pouring of Wine into it, I desire the Reader to suspend his Judgment, till he shall have considered what follows, not many Pages hence, in relation to *Irenæus*'s *Commixtionem & Temperamentum calicis*. And yet this is the only Word I am sensible of in all that Liturgy, that can be applied to the present Occasion. And here I beg leave by the way to observe concerning this Liturgy, that it is manifestly against the *Talmudick* Distinction about *the Fruit of the Tree*, if understood in our Author's Sense; inasmuch as the Cup before it is pretended to be mixed is called here Ποτήριον ἐκ τῆς γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου, *The Cup of the Fruit of the Vine*, that is

(p) Ἐπειδὴ γάρ εἰσί τινες ἐν ταῖς μυστηρίοις ὕδατι κεχρημένοι, δείκνυσι ὅτι ἡνίκα τὰ μυστήρια παρέδωκεν, οἶνον παρέδωκε,—ἐκ τῆς γενήματος, φησι, τῆς ἀμπέλου, &c. In St. *Matt.* xxvi. 29.

(q) *Reasons*, p. 8. (r) Ὁμοίως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ἐκ τῆς γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου λαβὼν, κεράσας, εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, ἁγιάσας. *Go. Euchol.* p. 168.

to

to ſay, of Wine without Water, it not being yet ſuppoſed to be mix'd. Wherefore in ſhort, our Author I think is brought into this *Dilemma*, that either κεράσας does not ſignify a *Mixture*, contrary to the End he produced it for; or the Cup, before this *Mixture* conſiſted of Wine only, and *ſo the Fruit of the Vine* ſignifies pure Wine, contrary to his Diſtinction from the *Talmud*. And by conſequence this Liturgy, inſtead of aſſiſting his Cauſe, lies as a poſitive Objection againſt it. And yet farther our learned Author, if he pleaſes, may undertake to prove from this Word, not only, that our Saviour inſtituted a Mixture, but that he did it in a Veſſel of Horn, and ſo made that Eſſential too. For it is certain the Etymology of the Verb κερά*ννυμι* is taken from the Cuſtom of drinking out of that ſort of Cup. As both (*s*) *Euſtathius* and (*t*) *Athenæus* teſtify. And St *Chryſoſtom*'s will not anſwer to this *Mixture*, but on the contrary makes uſe of Two different ones, a cold before, and a warm one after Conſecration, which would not be thought proper at this Time, and is not in the leaſt pretended to be of our Saviour's Inſtitution. Which yet it may reaſonably be ſuppoſed they would have taken care to ſtick to, had they really believed the Water in the Euchariſt to be any neceſſary Part of it.

And now ſince this Tradition for the Mixture is neither from the Beginning, nor Univerſal, nor Uninterrupted, and ſo fails as to each of the Branches of *Vincentius Lirinenſis*'s (*u*) Rule, a great Part of the Pleas for it are already ſunk, and its

---

(*s*) Τὸ κερᾶν δὲ παλαιᾶς οἰνοχοείας διὰ κέρατος ὄνομα. *In* Il. 3. p. 319. (*t*) Ὅτι δὲ τοῖς κέρασιν ἔπινον, δῆλον, &c. *Deipnoſoph.* l. 11. c. 7. (*u*) Quod ſemper, quod ubique, quod ad omnibus.

Proof hereby very much weakened, if not totally demoliſhed. However, let us ſee what Evidences there are for it, and whether they amount at beſt to more than the bare Uſe of it, in thoſe Places where it was; or whether any of them urge it as of Neceſſity, to the Eſſence and Efficacy of the Sacrament. And here I hope I ſhall be able to prove that

2. This Tradition, where it does extend, is not ſo full and ſatisfactory, as it is given out to be.

The firſt Witneſs produced for it is *Juſtin Martyr*. And as to him the Anſwerer had ſaid, he mentioned it not *till about* (w) 150 *Years after our Saviour's Incarnation? And* (x) *is not this early enough?* ſays our Author. To which I anſwer, no; not *early enough* to prove it was from the Beginning; not *early enough* to prove it was in our Saviour's Time; not *early enough* to prove it was in the Days of his Apoſtles. But farther, our Author (y) *believes Ten Years may fairly be cut off from this Computation.* And if he, or any one elſe, will pleaſe to give me a good Reaſon for it, I ſhall readily ſubmit. But at preſent I cannot do it, becauſe *Juſtin* himſelf forbids it; plainly intimating that our Bleſſed (z) Saviour was born 150 Years before his writing the Apology here referred to. But to proceed, it was farther objected, (a) that *what* Juſtin *meant by his κρᾶμα is not eaſy to define.* Becauſe, though this Word frequently denotes *a Compoſition of Wine and Water*, it cannot ſignify ſo in this Place, where *the Father ſpeaks of a Mixture before the Water was put to it.* Nor does our learned Author undertake in the leaſt to ſhew,

---

(w) *No Reaſon.* p. 3. (x) *Defence*, p. 2. (y) *Pag.* 3.
(z) Περὶ ἐκάστου ἐκαλῶν πενθήκοντα γεγεννῆθαι τὸν Χριστὸν λέγειν ἡμᾶς ὅτι κυρηνίου. *Apol.* 2. p. 83. *Edit. Par.*
(a) *No Reaſon*, p. 4.

what

what Sort of Mixture it was, that was made without Water; but he tells us roundly, (*b*) *That* Juſtin Martyr *meant Wine mixed with Water by* κρᾶμα, *is beyond Diſpute, notwithſtanding our Author's Objection.* As much as to ſay, it muſt, and ſhall be ſo, though the Argument againſt it cannot be anſwered. This is making ſhort Work of it. Nevertheleſs, *This*, he ſays, *is clear beyond Diſpute, from Two other Teſtimonies of this Father, informing us that Bread, and Wine, and Water, was brought to the Preſident, or Biſhop, and that the Deacons gave all the Congregation Part of the Bread, and Wine, and Water, which was euchariſtiz'd.* But I muſt beg this worthy Gentleman's Pardon, if I cannot think we have here any Anſwer to the Objection; which was that in the Place chiefly referred to, there was a κρᾶμα beſides the Water; which therefore could not be Wine and Water by his own Confeſſion. For he not only brings no Inſtance, that κρᾶμα ſignifies Wine without Water, but on the contrary, he expreſly affirms, (*c*) that κρᾶμα *never ſignifies Wine unmix'd.* And again, (*d*) *Though Wine does not always import a Mixture, yet* κρᾶμα does. But what then becomes of the Water *Juſtin Martyr* ſpeaks of, beſides the κρᾶμα? For it is ποτήριον ὕδατος καὶ κράματος, *a Cup of Water and Mixture.* Our learned Author tells us, *It was moſt probably the Water the Deacon gave the Biſhop and Prieſts, who aſſiſted at the Altar to waſh their Hands,* &c. and *That this was a Cuſtom before officiating at the Communion-Service, we learn from* Cyril *of* Jeruſalem. To which Doctrine I have two Exceptions that are not to be got over. The one, that the Uſe of ſuch a Cuſtom in *Cyril*'s Time will not prove, that the ſame was known in *Juſtin*'s, who lived 200

(*b*) *Defence*, p. 3. (*c*) *Page* 4. (*d*) *Page* 56.

Years

Years before him. The other, that though the Biſhop and Prieſts ſhould be ſuppoſed to waſh their Hands before communicating, as is ſaid; we are very ſure, it was not in the Euchariſtick Cup that they did it. And the Water ſpoken of by the Anſwerer was undoubtedly in that Cup. For *Juſtin Martyr* is very poſitive. So that howſoever, that Father ſpeaks of no other Mixture but Water and Wine in Two other Places, yet according to our Author's own Doctrine he could not do it here. And by Conſequence the Anſwerer's Objection ſtands as firm and unſhaken as ever.

And in the Two Places where he ſpeaks only of Bread, and Wine, and Water, he only tells us how they uſed ſuch a Mixture; but does not ſay our Lord, whether by himſelf or his Apoſtles, commanded all his Diſciples in all Ages to uſe it. Which yet would have been neceſſary to prove it an Eſſential Part of our Religion. *Juſtin* I ſay does not teach this; though our learned Author is pleaſed to affirm he does. (e) *He acquaints the Emperor*, ſays our Author, that the Deacons gave all the Congregation Part of the Bread, Wine and Water which was Euchariſtized, *or Bleſſed by Conſecration.* This *Juſtin* ſpeaks of as a Practice in his Time, but does not ſay our Saviour did the ſame at his Inſtitution: Which makes what follows very ſurpriſing. *Then he adds*, ſays our Author, *that the Apoſtles were commanded by our Saviour to celebrate in the ſame manner*; and refers to the ſame Place for the Proof of this Aſſertion. But he was ſo wiſe as not to produce *Juſtin*'s Words; which if he had related, every one would immediately have ſeen, that they could

(e) *Defence*, p. 3.

never

never anſwer his Deſign. *Juſtin* writes that (*f*) *the Apoſtles in thoſe Records of theirs called the Goſpels, teach that Jeſus commanded them thus; That having taken Bread, and given Thanks, he ſaid, Do this in remembrance of me; This is my Body; and likewiſe having taken the Cup and given Thanks, he ſaid this is my Blood.* Where is not one Word, that we do not as readily aſſent to, as our learned Author himſelf, here not being ſo much as any the leaſt Hint of a Mixture to be made by them.

Our Author ſubjoins, that *unleſs our Saviour really inſtituted ſuch a Mixture,* (*g*) *we muſt ſuppoſe theſe* Primo-primitive *Chriſtians.* This I ſhould have thought to mean thoſe of the firſt Age, before which there was none others, not ſuch as came after them, though in the Ages immediately following. But to let that paſs. *We muſt ſuppoſe theſe Primo-primitive Chriſtians guilty of going off from his Precedent and Command.* By which I preſume is meant tranſgreſſing his Inſtitution. And if ſo, the Inference I would rather make from hence, as much more reaſonable, ſince I find nothing in Scripture to the contrary; is, that they looked upon the Mixture as an indifferent Rite, to which they were no more obliged, than to the Uſe of *unleavened Bread.* It had been ſaid before, (*h*) " *Where there is no Law, there is no Tranſgreſſion,* " Rom. iv. 15. And by conſequence, to make " Water neceſſary with the Wine, ſome Precept " enjoining it ſhould have accompanied the In-

---

(*f*) Οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντεῖλάσθαι αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λαβόντα ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου· καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου. *Apol.* 2. p. 98.

(*g*) *Defence*, p. 4. (*h*) *No Reaſon*, p. 37. 38.

" ſtitu-

" ſtitution. Which ſeeing there is not, the moſt " that can be made of it is only, that it is to be " accounted as an uncommanded Uſage, which if " it may be lawfully practiſed, may yet as law- " fully be let alone. And as our Saviour ſays no- " thing of the Mixture, ſo it is no impertinent " Argument of Mr. *Daillée* in relation to his A- " poſtles. *This is a ſufficient Satisfaction to me, that* " *a Mixture of Water with the Wine is not neceſſary,* " *to the right Performance of the Sacrament, that we* " *ſee neither Chriſt did appoint and command it, nor* " *the Apoſtles deliver any thing like it, or give the* " *leaſt Intimation of it, in their Diſcourſes, either* " *about the Euchariſt, or not. For if they had either* " *uſed any thing of this Nature, or approved of it,* " *it could hardly be that they ſhould not ſomewhere,* " *either deſignedly, or by the By, have interſperſed* " *ſomething concerning it; as it is well known the* " Latins *do now, and the Fathers did formerly,* " *philoſophizing upon many Occaſions, and largely,* " *concerning the mingling of Water with the Wine,* " *and diſcovering wonderful Myſteries in it. That* " *theſe have acted after this manner, but the Apoſtles* " *did not, I ſee no other Cauſe, but that the one were* " *little concerned, whether the Celebration was in pure* " *Wine or a Mixture, and therefore would not trouble* " *the World about it, but the others were Zealous* " *for it, as for a Matter of great Moment.* " And whether the Apoſtles, or thoſe that came after, are chiefly to be attended to, is no difficult Matter to determine. And now what does our learned Author anſwer to all this? To the former Part he ſays nothing. And to Mr. *Daillée*'s Aſſertion that the Apoſtles did not give the leaſt Intimation of the Mixture, he tells us (*i*) *Juſtin Martyr*

(*i*) *Defence*, p. 50.

did

did. *This Father*, says he, *where he gives the Emperor an account, that the Bread, and Wine, and Water, were Eucharistized or Blessed, adds, that our Saviour commanded his Apostles to celebrate in the same manner.* Than which he could not well have said more, if he had looked upon his Apology as Canonical Scripture, which it was never yet pretended to be. So that according to this way of arguing, our Faith in this Point is not to be resolved into the Doctrine of the Scriptures, but into the Sayings of *Justin Martyr*, and the following Ecclesiastical Writers. And thus we are to have henceforward a new Rule of Faith never taught by our Saviour or his Apostles, nor known to *Justin* himself, and those that are appealed to with him. To promote this he adds, (*k*) *Justin Martyr*, as *Photius* speaks, *was little behind the Apostles, either in Time, or Value.* Which shews sufficiently that *Photius* owned, and indeed he could not but own, that he was behind them in both, and so not to be equalled to any of them in either. He proceeds, *Against this celebrated Father Daillée's Testimony is produced, an Antiepiscopal Divine.* But if he had taken Time to write a little more deliberately, he might have seen that *Daillée's* Testimony was not produced against *Justin Martyr*, or any one else. For it was not his Authority, but his Argument that was referred to, to prove that the Water in the Mixture could be looked upon, in the Apostolical Age, as no more than an uncommanded indifferent Rite. And if the Argument were strong and conclusive, I am not concerned whatever Sort of Divine it was that made use of it. And now that we have mentioned this *Antiepiscopal Divine*, I hope I may make use of another Saying of his to our Purpose, without affronting *Justin Martyr*; and I desire our learned Author to

(*k*) Ibid.

disprove it, if he can. (*l*) *We know from* Justin Martyr *that Water was mixed with the Wine: But that any one was ever condemned by him, as guilty of a grievous Sin, for celebrating the Eucharist in Bread and Wine only, we do not know.* Whence it appears, our Author had no Reason for his undeserved Reflection, *Whether St.* Justin's *or* Daillée's *Authority is chiefly to be attended to, is no difficult Matter to determine*, there being no Occasion given for it, as neither is it at all an Answer to the Argument proposed. The Result of what has been said as to this Father's Testimony is, that as it is not yet shewn what κρᾶμα, or Mixture, there was in the Cup besides Water; so neither are they that used it to be charged with Prevarication, if they used it only for Convenience, and as an indifferent Circumstance, and that it does not yet appear they made more of it.

Next come (*m*) *Irenæus* and *Clemens Alexandrinus*: And as to these the Answerer had objected, that though they speak of a Mixture, neither of them said any thing of its Necessity. Whereto is answered, (*n*) as to the former of them, that he said our Saviour called *the mix'd Cup* his Blood; that he charged the *Ebionites* with *rejecting the Mixture of the heavenly Wine*, and only made use of Water; and again, that our Lord promised his Disciples *to drink the* mix'd Cup *new with them in his Kingdom*. To all which Passages I reply.

1. He speaks after a very different manner upon other Occasions. He affirms of our Saviour, that (*o*) *He confessed the Cup, which is of the Creature*,

(*l*) A Justino mixtam vino aquam scimus: Damnatum ab eo gravis peccati quenquam ideò nullis, quod ex pane & mero Eucharistiam faceret, nescimus. *De cult. Relig. Latinorum.* l. 3. c. 7.

(*m*) *No Reason*, p. 5. (*n*) *Defence*, p. 5. (*o*) Τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς κτίσεως ποτήριον, ὅμα ὡμολόγησε. *Adv. Hæres.* l. 5. c. 2.

to

to be his Blood. Which surely would have been of the *Creatures*, in the plural Number, if he had meant it of Water as well as Wine. And again, (*p*) *He promised to drink of the Fruit of the Vine, with his Disciples; hereby shewing both the earthly Inheritance, in which the new Fruit of the Vine is drunk, and the Resurrection of the Flesh of his Disciples.* And to explain himself the better a little after, he speaks of (*q*) *the Drink which is from the Vine*; which can be nothing else but Wine. And can it be thought he would have delivered himself in this manner, if he had believed a Mixture of Water necessary with the Wine?

2. It is not certain *Irenæus*'s *Temperamentum calicis, & Commixtio calicis*, mean as our Author understands them; that is to say, it is not certain that they, or either of them, can be taken necessarily to imply a Mixture of Water in the Cup. And the Reason is, because in very good Authors, both *Greek* and *Latine*, Profane and Sacred, Miscere, and Μιγνύειν, or Κεραννύειν, and other Words of affinity with them, frequently signify no more than to pour into a Cup, or to give to drink. Thus (*r*) *Miscere* is used by *Juvenal*, (*s*) *Misceri &*

(*p*) Promisit bibere de generatione vitis, cum suis Discipulis, utrumque ostendens, & hæreditatem terræ, in quâ bibitur nova generatio vitis, & carnalem resurrectionem Discipulorum ejus. *l.* 5. *c.* 33.

(*q*) Qui ex vite accipitur potus. *Ibid.*

(*r*) Nescit tot millibus emptus Pauperibus miscere puer. *Sat. v. v.* 60. *Which Words* Lubin, *expounds to mean*, Non vult pauperibus clientibus infundere.

(*s*) Misceri sibi protinus deunces, sed crebros jubet. *l.* 6. *Epig.* 78. *Id est, Imperat sibi porrigi deunces, sed frequentes.* Vincen. Coles. *in loc.* Hic Scyphus est, in quo misceri jussit amicis Largius Æacides *l.* 8. Epigr. 6. *Scilicet hic est Scyphus, in quo Achilles imperavit plenius infundi amicis.* Id. Quis mihi qui nectar misceat alter erit? *l.* 9. Epig. 37. *Id est, Quem habebo alterum, qui ministret nectar?* Id.

Miſceat, by *Martial*; (*t*) *Miſceat*, by *Tully*; & Μίσγον, Κέρασε, & Κεκρᾶσθαι, by (*u*) *Homer*. But the Inſtances I principally depend upon, are thoſe Two of the Apoſtle St. *John* in the Revelation. *Chap.* xiv. 10. He ſpeaks of *the Wine of the Wrath of God poured forth without Mixture*; κεκερασμένου ἀκράτου, unmix'd Wine, which therefore cannot be ſaid to be *mix'd*, but only to be *poured forth*. And ſo our Tranſlation renders it very rightly, *The ſame ſhall drink of the Wine of the Wrath of God, which is* POURED FORTH WITHOUT MIXTURE *into the Cup of his Indignation*. And again, *Chap.* xviii. 6. Ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ ᾧ ἐκέρασε, κεράσατε αὐτῇ διπλοῦν. *In the Cup*, not which ſhe hath mixed, but *which ſhe hath* FILLED, FILL *unto her double*. From which Uſe of theſe Words, it is manifeſt, that ſome conſiderable Pains will be required to aſſure us, that the pretended Mixture is implied in theſe Expreſſions of *Irenæus*. And if this cannot be effected, as it certainly never can, then they are brought to no Purpoſe; and ſtill there is not a Word in this Father, from whence the Neceſſity of the Mixture may fairly be inferred, but rather the contrary.

3. But it may be what he teſtifies of the *Ebionites*, may be thought more convincing, (*w*) *That they rejected the Mixture of the heavenly Wine, and only made uſe of Water*; becauſe if there had been

(*t*) Dico ergo in eadem voluptate eum qui alteri miſceat mulſum, ipſe non ſitiens, & eum qui illud ſitiens bibat? *De fin. bon. & mal.* l. 2.

(*u*) Ὄρχια πρὸ θεῶν σύναγον, κρητῆρι δὲ οἶνον Μίσγον. *Il.* 3. On which Words ſays *Euſtathius*; Οὐ μεμιγμένον, ἀλλ' ἀκεράστως δὲ σπονδήν. Ζωρότερον δὲ κέρασε, δηλονότι ἔνδυνον ἑαυτῷ. *Il.* 10. where he expounds ζωρὸν by ἄκρατον; and ſo in Effect declares, that κέρασε could not ſignify *Mix*, but *Pour out*. Κρητῆρες τ' ἄφθονα οἶνον. *Odyſſ.* 22. Τέλεσι, ſays he, ἐμβάλλουσι ἐς κρατῆρας. And again, on *Il.* 3. *p.* 319, he gives this Etymology of the Verb κεράω, as I noted before, that Τὸ κεραῦν δὲ παλαιᾶς οἰνοχοείας διὰ κέρατος ὄντος. Which does not any way look towards a Mixture.

(*w*) *Defence*, p. 6.

both

both Wine and Water, there must inevitably *have been a Mixture.* But neither will this at all Answer the Design. For,

1. *Irenæus*'s Words are by no means rightly translated. We are told indeed *They only made use of Water.* But in *Irenæus* it is, *sola aqua sæcularis volunt esse, They will be only secular Water.* And what the Meaning of this Phrase is, is not easy to be known: But these Two Things are indisputable in relation to it. That the true rendring of it cannot possibly be, *They only made use of Water.* And that it is no Sign of a good Cause, that it is to be supported by such unintelligible Citations, as are not to the purpose, and prove nothing; nor can be made to seem to do it, if truly represented.

2. It is beyond Question, that it was the Wine, not the Water, *Irenæus* argues for, and of the Want whereof he complains, in these *Ebionites.*

3. The latter Part of the Sentence is advantagiously omitted; *non recipientes Deum ad Commixtionem suam*, not receiving God to their filled Cup. For so I presume I may justly translate it, after what has already been said. Wherein *Irenæus* seems plainly to suggest these Two Things. First, That God was represented and convey'd by the Wine alone; since their Cup could not thus convey or represent him. And Secondly, That he calls *their* Cup, which our Author declares to have consisted of *Water only*, *Commixtionem suam*; a manifest Instance that *Irenæus* did not mean so much by *Commixtionem*, as our Author infers from it, and as is absolutely necessary for his Argument.

The Summ is, that *Irenæus* says our Saviour's Cup was *of the Creature*, not of the *Creatures*, as Wine and Water are, and calls it *the Fruit of the Vine*, and *the Drink which is from the Vine*; that when he calls the Cup a Mixture he does not neces-

ceſſarily appear to mean it in our Author's Senſe, and when he ſpeaks of the *Ebionites* he ſhews plainly he does not and cannot mean it ſo; and that it is the Wine and not the Water he pleads for; and charges the *Ebionites* that for want of it God had nothing to do with their Cup. Which ſeveral Particulars, if our Author will pleaſe impartially to conſider, I may leave it to himſelf to judge, whether this Father can be thought to be of his Side of the Cauſe; and eſpecially whether he has ſaid any Thing to prove the Eſſentiality of the Mixture.

The next Evidence is *Clemens Alexandrinus*; and of him it is obſervable, that as he ſays nothing for the Mixture, ſo he has divers Teſtimonies againſt it. Our Author is pleaſed to teach, that both *Irenæus* and *Clement (x) give in plain Evidence for the Uſage.* As to the former, of whom I have already ſhewn, that he has, if rightly interpreted, ſaid nothing material for the Mixture, but on the contrary has owned the *Wine* to be our Saviour's Blood: Which in my Opinion is good Evidence againſt it. And the ſame I ſhall now ſhew of the other. Only in the mean Time, if I ſhall not be ſaid to grant, by ſuppoſing it, I will ſuppoſe the Words of both of them to be meant in our Author's Senſe, and ſee then what he can make of them. Suppoſe they ſpeak ſometimes of *Wine alone*, and at others of *a Mixture*, rather than an Effuſion; what elſe can be collected from hence, but that howſoever they expreſs themſelves, they could lay no great Weight upon it, whether the Wine were mix'd or pure? But our Author farther takes notice, (y) that the Anſwerer had replied in relation to the Mixture, *That neither of them ſpeak a Word of its being Neceſſary.* And I thought upon

(x) *Defence*, p. 5. (y) Ibid.

this

this I might reaſonably have expected to ſee it very plainly proved that they do it. But when I came to examine their Evidence, if I had, I ſhould have found my ſelf ſadly diſappointed. *Irenæus* indeed pleads a Neceſſity of Wine againſt the *Ebionites*; but neither of them ſays, our Saviour enjoyned his Diſciples, to uſe any thing more as neceſſary to the Sacrament, than Wine. And conſequently they have never declared the Neceſſity of a Mixture; which our Author would infer from ſome Words of theirs, but cannot find it ſaid by them, or either of them. This I have already ſhewn as to *Irenæus*; and now I proceed to ſhew the ſame of *Clement*. Our Author indeed profeſſes, (*a*) *Nothing can be fuller to the Purpoſe, than what we find in Clemens Alexandrinus*; "That "the Λόγος, or eternal Word of God, ordered "the Blood of the Grape to be mix'd with Wa- "ter, as his own Blood has Happineſs or Salva- "tion incorporated with it. „ Yet what he can make of this, that ſhould prove ſo wonderfully to his *Purpoſe*, would puzzle any one elſe to diſcover. For I cannot ſee how the original Words, as cited in his own Margin, can have any other Signification, than what the ingenious Author of the *No Neceſſity to alter the Common-prayer* has aſſign'd them, (*b*) namely, either *The Divine* Λόγος *being willing to be mix'd with the Water of the Blood of the Grape, as his Blood is mingled with Salvation:* Or elſe, *The Blood of the Grape, to wit, the* WORD *being willing to be mix'd with Water*, &c. And either way the Expreſſion is ſo Dark and Myſtical, that it is hard to explain the Senſe of it, but impoſſible to ſhew it is at all *to the Purpoſe*, to which it is ſaid to be ſo *Full*. Eſpecially, if it be remembered, that our Saviour's ſuppoſed Mixture

(*a*) *Page* 6. (*b*) *No Neceſſity*, p. 12.

cannot

cannot be imagined to be recommended here, as a Pattern for the Celebration of the Euchariſt, but only in order to a ſtrict Sobriety in all our Converſation; this whole Chapter being levelled, not againſt ſuch as would have the Sacrament adminiſtred in pure Wine, but againſt Drunkenneſs and Exceſs at other Times; and therefore far from an Evidence *full* to our preſent *Purpoſe*, had the Words been more intelligible than they muſt be allowed to be. Beſides, it is worth noting, that towards the End of this ſame Chapter, being earneſt in proving our Saviour uſed to drink Wine, he not only ſays, (*c*) Μετέλαβεν ὅπερ ἦν αὐτὸς, *He himſelf partook of* WINE; but farther, (*d*) *He bleſſed the* WINE, *ſaying, Take, drink, this is my Blood, the Blood of the Grape.* And a little after, (*e*) *He ſhewed again, that what was bleſſed was* WINE, *ſaying to his Diſciples I will drink no more of the Fruit of this Vine, until I drink it with you in my Father's Kingdom.* Which Words I may well ſay are much *fuller to the Purpoſe*, for the Uſe of Wine only, than thoſe produced by our Author for the Uſe of the Mixture. For the Father not only ſays, *He partook of the Wine*, but that *He bleſſed the Wine*, and called *it his Blood, the Blood of the Grape*; *that what he bleſſed was Wine*, not a Mixture, but Wine, calling it expreſly *the Fruit of the Vine.* So that it is ſtrange this Father ſhould be brought in in behalf of the Mixture, of which he ſays nothing, and againſt Wine alone in the Euchariſt, for which he ſays ſo much. And yet to improve his Autho-

(*c*) Pæd. 2. c. 2. p. 186.

(*d*) Εὐλόγησέν γε τὸν οἶνον, εἰπών, λάβετε, πίετε, τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα, αἷμα τῆς ἀμπέλου. *Ibid.*

(*e*) Ὅτι δὲ οἶνος ἦν τὸ εὐλογηθὲν, ἀπέδειξε πάλιν, πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγων. Οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ταύτης, μέχρις ἂν πίω αὐτὸ μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Πατρός μου. *Ibid.*

rity

rity a little farther; he presently applies what he had been saying to the *Encratites*, (*f*) great Professors of Abstemiousness, and *who condemned Wine as Diabolical*, to shew how much they were out in their Refusal of it. And if from hence any should conclude that our Lord by this Argument was proved to drink Wine, but not exclusive of Water with it; it is easy to reply, not only that 'tis not reasonable to conceive the holy Father would expound so solemn a Text as this is, in so defective a manner; but that moreover, the Business he was at that very Time upon, being to press Temperance in Drinking, it would have given his Argument the greater Force, if he could have told them our Lord would not bless his own Cup, otherwise than as diluted with Water. And had he been of our learned Author's Opinion, no doubt he would have done it. And even as to the *Encratites* themselves, it had not been less convincing; in as much as the Use of Wine by our Saviour himself, would have confuted their Abomination of it, and by Informing them farther that Water was mix'd with it, it had more probably won those *Zealots for Water alone*, to receive the Truth. So that nothing seems to incline this learned Father, to apply the Text of Consecration to our Saviour's drinking Wine, and at the same Time to conceal the Mixture of it, but that he either had no Notion of such a Mixture, or else conceived the Water to be a Circumstance of no Consideration in the consecrated Cup. Though I must own the former of these, that he knew of no such Mixture, to be most likely, because suiting best with the Argument he was then upon. So that the Matter in short, as to this Father, is this;

(*f*) Epiphan. Hæres. 47. c. 1.

he not only does not teach the great Neceſſity of a Mixture in the Holy Euchariſt, but it cannot be proved that he does any way recommend it, or in Truth ſo much as once mention it, though he ſpeaks over and over of Wine alone as the proper Matter of our Saviour's Cup.

Thus we have gone through the two firſt Ages of the Church: And by what has been ſaid it may be ſeen, that as there is not any one Writer of the former of them, that is ſo much as pretended to have made the leaſt Mention of the Mixture ſo zealouſly inſiſted upon; ſo neither is there any in the next, that gives any manner of Proof for it. And we have no other offered till the middle of the Third Age, and none then, that ſhews any neceſſity of the Mixture, the Point that was to have been proved.

The only ſuppoſed Advocate that we know of for the Mixture in the Third Century is St. *Cyprian*; of whom we are told, (g) *The Anſwerer confeſſes this Father is very poſitive for the Uſe of the Water, and averrs it our Saviour's Inſtitution.* And I deny not but St. *Cyprian* ſpeaks ſometimes this way, and eſpecially where he is treating of his ſuppoſed emblematical Uſe and Signification of the Cup, to denote the Union betwixt Chriſt and Believers. But then it is to be noted on the other hand, that at other times he delivers himſelf after a very different Manner, earneſtly contending for the Wine to be put in the Cup; and not ſo for the Water, which though he often allows to be there, yet he undertakes not to prove it neceſſarily ſo, the only Thing we differ about. Beſides that ſometimes again he ſpeaks of Wine only; which does not look as if his fixed Judgment were, that the Water is ſo highly and abſolutely neceſſary, as is pretended.

(g) *Defence*, p. 7.

Firſt,

Firſt, I ſay, his Arguments for the Mixture are in behalf of the Wine not of the Water. Thus he ſpeaks in the firſt Page of his Epiſtle to *Cæcilius*, (*h*) Admonitos autem nos ſcias &c. *Know we are admoniſhed, to obſerve our Lord's Tradition in offering the Cup, and that nothing elſe be done by us, but what our Lord himſelf did firſt: That the Cup which is offered in Commemoration of him, be offered with a Mixture of Wine. For when Chriſt ſays, I am the true Vine, the Blood of Chriſt is* NOT WATER BUT WINE. *Nor can his Blood, whereby we are redeemed, and enlivened be ſeen to be in the Cup, when the Wine is wanting by which his Blood is Shewn forth.* And a little after ſpeaking of *Noah*, that (*i*) *exhibiting a Type of what ſhould afterwards truly come to paſs, he drank not Water but Wine, and ſo expreſſed the Image of our Lord's Paſſion.* It follows, (*k*) *We ſee alſo the Sacrament of our Lord's Sacrifice prefigured in the Prieſt Melchiſedeck, as the divine Scripture teſtifies, and ſays; And Melchiſedeck King of Salem, brought forth Bread and Wine—But that Melchiſedeck bare a Type of Chriſt, the Holy Spirit declares in the Book of Pſalms, from the Perſon of the Father, ſaying to the Son, Before the Morning I begat thee, thou art a Prieſt for ever after the Order of Melchiſedeck; (l) The Image of Chriſt's Sacrifice preceeds, conſiſting of Bread and Wine, which Thing our Lord perfecting and fulfilling, offered Bread and a Cup, mixt with*

(*h*) *Page* 148. (*i*) Quod *Noe* typum futuræ veritatis oſtendens; non aquam, ſed vinum biberit; & ſic imaginem Dominicæ paſſionis expreſſerit. *Pag.* 149.

(*k*) Item in ſacerdote Melchiſedech ſacrificii Dominici ſacramentum præfiguratum videmus, ſecundum quod ſcriptura divina teſtatur & dicit; & Melchiſedech rex ſalem protulit Panem & Vinum.—Quod autem Melchiſedech typum Chriſti portaret, declarat in Pſalmis Spiritus ſanctus, *&c.* *Ibid.*

(*l*) Præcedit ante imago ſacrificii Chriſti in pane & vino ſcilicet conſtituta, quam rem perficiens & adimplens Dominus, panem & calicem mixtum vino obtulit. *Ibid.*

Wine. And again (*m*) *Come, eat of my Bread, and drink of the Wine which I have mingled for you. He declares it to be mixt Wine, that is he in a prophetical manner foretels, that the Lord's Cup ſhall be mixt with Wine and Water; to the end it may appear that in our Lord's Paſſion, that was performed which had been foretold.* (*n*) *We ſee the Cup was mixt which our Lord offered, and that it was Wine that he called his Blood. Whence it is apparent, that the Blood of Chriſt is not offered, unleſs there be Wine in the Cup.* And ſpeaking of thoſe who uſed a Cup without Wine, he complains, (*o*) *Thus the Brotherhood begins from the Paſſion of Chriſt, to be ſtopt in their Career in Times of Perſecution, whilſt in their Oblations they learn to be aſhamed of his Blood and Gore.* And in the next Page he asks to the ſame purpoſe, (*p*) *How can we ſhed our Blood for Chriſt, who are aſhamed to drink Chriſt's Blood?* And yet once more, (*q*) *We are admoniſhed and taught by the Lord, to offer the Lord's Cup mixt with Wine, as the Lord himſelf offered.* Here every one may ſee that St. *Cyprian*'s Zeal for the Mixture

---

(*m*) Venite, edite de meis panibus, & bibite vinum quod miſcui vobis. Vinum mixtum declarat, id eſt, calicem Domini aquâ & vino mixtum propheticâ voce prænunciat; ut appareat in paſſione Dominicâ id eſſe geſtum, quod fuerat ante prædictum. *Ibid.*

(*n*) Quâ in parte invenimus calicem mixtum fuiſſe, quem Dominus obtulit, & vinum fuiſſe quod ſanguinem ſuum dixit. Unde apparet ſanguinem Chriſti non offerri, ſi deſit vinum calici. *Pag.* 152.

(*o*) Sic ergo incipit à paſſione Chriſti in perſecutionibus fraternitas retardari, dum in oblationibus diſcit de ſanguine ejus & cruore confundi. *Pag.* 155.

(*p*) Quomodo autem poſſumus propter Chriſtum ſanguinem fundere, qui ſanguinem Chriſti erubeſcimus bibere? *P.* 156.

(*q*) A Domino admoniti & inſtructi ſumus, ut calicem Dominicum vino mixtum, ſecundum quod Dominus obtulit, offeramus. *Pag.* 157.

was

was not for the Water to be put into the Cup, but for not leaving the Wine out of it. This he knew to be of abſolute Neceſſity, becauſe our Saviour's Blood could not be repreſented without it, and therefore preſſes to have it by no means omitted, againſt ſuch as were for communicating in Water only; whether becauſe they thought it more ſuitable for the Morning in their early Communions, or leaſt their Breath ſhould betray them to their Enemies, or for whatſoever other Cauſe; diſputing with ſuch he does not condemn the Uſe of Water together with Wine, and therefore ſeveral times calls it *a mixt Cup*. But yet the Bent of his Argument is conſtantly in favour of the Wine, as without which our Saviour's Blood cannot be ſhewn forth.

2. In the next place ſpeaking of Water, he teaches that (*r*) whenſoever this *is named alone in Scripture, it is to be looked upon as an Emblem*, not of the holy Euchariſt, but of the other Sacrament *of Baptiſm*. An Inſtance whereof he gives us (*ſ*) in *Iſaiah*, in theſe Words, *Behold I do a new thing: now it ſhall ſpring forth, ſhall ye not know it? becauſe I give waters in the wilderneſs, and rivers in the deſart, to give drink to my people, my choſen.* (*t*) *There*, ſays St. *Cyprian*, *God foretold by the Prophet, that amongſt the Gentiles, in Places which had formerly been without Water, in time Rivers ſhould abound; and ſhould refreſh the choſen People of God, being made his Sons by baptiſmal Re-*

(*r*) Quotieſcunque autem aqua ſola in ſcripturis ſanctis nominatur, baptiſma prædicatur. *Ead. Epiſt.* p. 150.

(*ſ*) *Iſ.* xliii. 19, 20.

(*t*) Prænunciavit per propheram Deus, quod apud gentes in locis, quæ inaquoſa prius fuiſſent, flumina poſtmodum redundarent; Et electum genus Dei, id eſt, per regenerationem baptiſmi, filios Dei factos adaquarent. *Pag.* 150.

generation.

generation. And again, *(u) He that believeth in me, as the Scripture ſaith, out of his belly ſhall flow rivers of living Water. And that it may the more clearly appear, that the Lord ſpeaks not there of the Cup, but of Baptiſm, the Scripture ſays farther, But this he ſpake of the Spirit which they that believed in him ſhould receive. For by Baptiſm the holy Spirit is received.* Thus you ſee he diſtinguiſhes between the Matter of the two Sacraments, obſerving Water properly to belong to the One, and Wine to the Other. Which evidently ſhews, as I ſaid, that though he does not diſapprove of Water in the Cup, and therefore calls it a mixt Cup, yet Wine is what he looks upon as eſſentially neceſſary to it, and therefore argues earneſtly for the conſtant Uſe of it.

3. And thus much he more expreſsly affirms, in another Part of the ſame Epiſtle; *(w) How perverſe, and how contrary is it, that when our Lord at the Marriage had made Wine of the Water, we* on the other hand *ſhould make Water of Wine, Whereas the Myſtery of that Thing ought to inſtruct and teach us, that we are rather to offer Wine in the Lord's Sacrifices.*

4. And laſtly, He ſpeaks divers times of the Wine in the Sacrament, without mentioning any Water, ſo as that an impartial Reader may eaſi-

---

(*u*) Qui credit in me, ſicut Scriptura dicit, flumina de ventre ejus fluent aquæ vivæ. Atque ut magis poſſit eſſe manifeſtum, quia non de calice, ſed de baptiſmo illic loquitur Dominus, addidit Scriptura, dicens: Hoc autem dixit de ſpiritu quem accepturi erant, qui in eum credebant. Per baptiſma enim ſpiritus ſanctus accipitur. *Ibid.*

(*w*) Quam vero perverſum eſt, quamque contrarium, ut cum Dominus in nuptiis de aquâ vinum fecerit, nos de vino aquam faciamus, cum ſacramentum quoque rei illius admonere & inſtruere nos debeat, ut in ſacrificiis Dominicis vinum potius offeramus. *Pag.* 153.

ly

ly ſee, he looked upon that as the only eſſential Part of that Species of the Sacrament. (x) *Who is more a Prieſt of God, than our Lord Jeſus Chriſt? who offered a Sacrifice to God the Father, and offered the very ſame that Melchiſedeck had offered, that is Bread and Wine, as much as to ſay, his Body and Blood.* And preſently after reciting that Part of *Jacob*'s Bleſſing pronounced upon his Son *Judah* a little before his Death, *Gen.* 49. 11. *He waſhed his Garments in Wine and his Clothes in the blood of Grapes*, he ſubjoins, (y) *When the Blood of the Grape is mentioned, what elſe is meant by it, but the Wine of the Cup of our Lord's Blood?* And immediately after this, (z) *Moreover the holy Spirit teſtifies the ſame thing by Eſaias, in relation to our Lord's Paſſion, ſaying; Wherefore art thou red in thine apparel, and thy garments like him that treadeth in the Wine fat? Can Water by any means make Garments red? Or is there any Water in the Wine-preſs, which is either trodden, or preſſed out? The Mention of Wine is plainly intended to ſignify our Lord's Blood; and that what was afterwards manifeſted in the Lord's Cup, ſhould be foretold by the Prophet's declaring it.* And in his Epiſtle to *Magnus* one of his Laity,

---

(x) Quis magis ſacerdos Dei quam Dominus noſter Jeſus Chriſtus? Qui ſacrificium Deo Patri obtulit, & obtulit hoc idem quod Melchiſedech obtulerat, id eſt, Panem & Vinum, ſuum ſcilicet corpus & ſanguinem. *Pag.* 149.

(y) Quando autem ſanguis uvæ dicitur, quid aliud quàm vinum calicis Dominici ſanguinis oſtenditur? *P.* 150.

(z) Necnon & apud Eſaiam hoc idem ſpiritus ſanctus de Domini paſſione teſtatur, dicens; Quare rubicunda ſunt veſtimenta tua; & indumenta tua velut à calcatione torcularis pleni & percalcati? Nunquid rubicunda veſtimenta aqua poteſt facere? Aut in torculari aqua eſt, quæ pedibus calcatur, vel prelo exprimitur? Vini utique mentio ideo ponitur, ut Domini ſanguis intelligatur; & quod in calice Dominico poſtea manifeſtatum eſt, Prophetis annunciantibus prædiceretur. *Ibid.*

in

in Anſwer to a Letter ſent to him, to beg Advice about the Admiſſion of thoſe to Communion, who returned from the Novatians, he has this Paſſage concerning our bleſſed Lord; (*a*) *He called the Wine, preſſed out of many Cluſters and Grapes, and forced together into one Body, his Blood.* Where he manifeſtly ſpeaks of the Wine alone, without the Mention of any Water, and ſuch indeed as could not be ſuppoſed to have Water in it, unleſs water could be preſſed out of Grapes, as well as Wine, and calls it our Saviour's Blood. And ſince nothing could be thought neceſſary in the Cup, but what was Sacramentally his Blood, how is it poſſible this Sort of Expreſſion could come from one that believed Water to be eſſential to the Sacrament?

Now put theſe Things together, that St *Cyprian's* Pleas for a Mixture, aimed at proving the Neceſſity of Wine in the Sacrament, not of Water; that he tells us when Water alone is ſpoken of in Scripture as the Matter of a Sacrament, it is of the other Sacrament of Baptiſm, and not of the Euchariſt; that he expreſly requires to offer Wine in the Cup rather than Water, and that he often mentions nothing as belonging to the Cup but Wine, and calls that our Saviour's Blood; and then let any man judge, whether St. *Cyprian* could be of Opinion, that Water was a neceſſary indiſpenſable Part of our Saviour's Inſtitution, and the Want of it a juſt Cauſe for Breach of Communion with thoſe that uſe it not; or whether (*b*) St. *Cyprian* is truly *deciſive in this Point.* If he be, it is for the Wine, and not for the Water. And if the Anſwerer were induced by our

---

(*a*) Sanguinem ſuum vinum appellat, de botris atque acinis plurimis expreſſum, atque in unum coactum. *Epiſt.* 69. p. 182. (*b*) *Reaſons*, &c. p. 4.

learned

learned Author's positive Assertions, and his own Haste and Want of due Consideration, to yield more than this comes to, it is not too late to set the Matter now in a better Light, as I think I have fully done; insomuch, that I might safely forbear the Defence of what had been said to prove, that by St. *Cyprian*'s Time some Error might obtain in the Church, and to that degree that even so great a man as St. *Cyprian* might happen to be drawn into it. However since such a Disquisition may tend more clearly to evince the Uncertainty of Tradition, where we have nothing else to depend upon, I shall beg the Reader's Patience, whilst I take notice of what has been objected under this Head; though with all the brevity I can.

1. And here it is urged, that it is only said to be possible St *Cyprian* might have been mistaken; (c) *and can this turn the Balance, or amount to the least Disproof?* Aud I own it is the lowest sort of Disproof; but yet it must be granted a sufficient Evidence of the Insufficiency of that Proof against which it is brought. And the Reason is, because I can never be sure a Thing is proved to be true, whilst yet for any thing I know it may be false.

2. Whereas it is said, (d) *He might be out in his Tradition for the Mixture, no less than in the Reason he assigns for it, that it might represent the near Relation betwixt Christ and his Church*, our learned Author inquires, (e) *Does the Answerer disprove this Reasoning? Not at all. He says no more than that 'tis possible he might be out. And if it is only possible he was in the wrong, 'tis highly probable he was in the right.* Where it is observa-

(c) *Defence*, p. 8. (d) *No Reason*, p. 7. (e) *Defence*, p. 8.

ble his Proof aims at no more than *a high Probability*, and whether that be enough to found the abſolute Neceſſity of a Duty upon, I leave to our Author himſelf to determine. But that St. *Cyprian* was out in the Reaſon he gives for the Mixture in the ſacramental Cup, can hardly be denied, by any one that conſiders how different his Reaſon for the Inſtitution of that Cup is from our Saviour's. Our Saviour appoints it to be *in Remembrance of himſelf*, and the bitter Paſſion he was about to undergo for our Redemption; St. *Cyprian* teaches it to be for repreſenting the intimate Union betwixt Chriſt and his People, which is very far from being the Reaſon our Lord aſſigns for it.

3. The Anſwerer had ſaid, (*f*) concerning the famous Controverſy, between Pope *Victor* and the *Aſiatick* Churches, about the Obſervation of *Eaſter*, *Here both Parties pleaded Tradition the one from St.* John *and* St. Philip, *the other from* St. Peter *and* St. Paul, *though in plain Contradiction to each other.* And what does our learned Author ſay to this? Does he at all deny it? Not in the leaſt. On the contrary, he ſays, (*g*) *We have great Reaſon, to believe the two different Traditions were both true.* But then he adds, that in Matters not Neceſſary, *the Apoſtles accommodated themſelves to the Notions of their Converts, and managed as the Reaſons of Time and Place ſuggeſted; and as to the Time of the Paſchal Solemnity they left no Deciſion or Command about it.* But the Queſtion was not about what the Apoſtles did, but what they that lived after them; and whether Tradition had ſettled this Matter ſo ſurely, as that no Contentions or Strifes aroſe about it, to the Diſtur-

(*f*) *No Reaſon*, p. 7. (*g*) *Defence*, p. 9.

tance

bance of the Church, and whether great Men were not engaged on both Sides. And this is not denied.

4. We are told (*b*) the *Millennium*, or our Saviour's *Reigning upon Earth for a Thouſand Years, is brought as a Second Inſtance of an erroneous Tradition. And here* Papias *is cited as having received this Tradition with many others from the Apoſtles. Here*, ſays our Author, *is ſome Miſtake in repreſenting the Matter.* And ſo indeed there is. But on which Side any one may ſee. For whoſoever but looks into the Anſwerer, (*i*) muſt needs ſee, he never ſaid that *Papias* ſaw, or converſed with any of the Apoſtles, but only that upon Inquiry, he *received many Traditions as from them.* Though if he had ſaid what our Author here charges him with, he had not been without ſome Countenance for it from (*k*) *Irenæus*, who calls him *a Hearer of St.* John. It follows, (*l*) *The* Millennian *Tradition was not very generally believed in thoſe early Ages of Chriſtianity.* Though *Euſebius* informs us, that (*m*) this Tradition was entertained *by moſt of the Clergy of thoſe times.* Juſtin Martyr *relates the Chriſtians were ſomewhat divided about it.* Now here I don't think it worth our while to examine into the utmoſt Extent of this Tradition; it being enough for me that the Doctrine was believed for a conſiderable time, and many great men came into it. Which ſuffices to ſhew it not improbable, that St. *Cyprian* might poſſibly be drawn in to eſpouſe a Tra-

(*b*) *Pag.* 11. (*i*) *No Reaſon*, p. 8. (*k*) Παπίας Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστὴς. L. v. c. 33. (*l*) *Defence*, p. 12.
(*m*) Πλὴν ἔγ πῶς μετ' αὐτὸν πλείσοις ὅσοις πρῶ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν ἀ ὁμοίας αὐτῷ δόξης παραίτιος γέγονε. Hiſt. Eccl. *l.* 3. *c.* 39.

dition no better founded than this; and the rather if there were more to be said for it. But it seems (*n*) *this Tradition may be orthodox, for ought the Answerer has said to the contrary.* Yet it is not generally thought to be so, nor has been for a long time. And let our Author take it which way he will, there must be an Error on one side, and many great Men have given into it. And so much himself confesses; *They split into Partys about it, and great Abettors were ranged on either side.* He is pleased indeed to say, (*o*) *the Parallell fails and the Reason is inconsequential.* But if he will give himself the trouble, to cast his eye again upon the Answer, he may soon perceive, no Parallell was there designed, but only that when ill proved Traditions have appeared, Great men have been too apt to be carried away with them. And for Confirmation hereof, *Hospinian* had been quoted, for an Observation of his (*p*) *That whatsoever religious Customs had got admittance into the Church, they were forthwith reckoned to have proceeded from Apostolical Tradition, and the Doctrine of the Holy Ghost.* And did our Author undertake to disprove this? no; he says not a Word to it in this place: Only afterwards without regard to that Observation, which he allows to stand without contradiction, he takes occasion to speak of *Hospinian* (*q*) as not fit to be set in competition for an Authority equal to *Justin Martyr*, *Irenæus*, &c. which he cannot but know was never intended, but only this Observation was quoted for the Usefulness of it. And he does not in the least deny it to be true.

(*n*) *Defence*, p. 13. (*o*) *Pag.* 14. [(*p*) *Histor. Sacramentar.* l. 2. c. 2. (*q*) *Defence*, p. 120.

5. Mention

5. Mention had been made (r) *of many ſpurious Writings, put forth under the Names, ſome of our Lord himſelf, and his bleſſed Mother; and many more under thoſe of the Apoſtles, and others of the firſt Diſciples.* This therefore our learned Author takes notice of. (ſ) But he does not in the leaſt deny the Truth of the Fact; as indeed he could not. All he ſays to it is, that the Spuriouſneſs of theſe Writings was detected by *the Church, and the ancient Fathers, who gave the World notice of them.* Which might very well be, and yet the Authors of them *might ſow ſuch counterfeit Traditions, as others much better than themſelves might ſwallow without due Examination*; even when all did not. It follows, *Why ſhould we ſuppoſe them leſs qualified or leſs careful about Oral Tradition?* Yet every one knows *Oral Tradition* is much more difficultly preſerved, from Corruptions and Innovations, than *Written*; and ſo Errors may ſooner creep in that way. Oh! but in the Caſe of the Sacrament it could not be. *The Chriſtians in the Primitive times received the Holy Euchariſt every Day. Upon what Pretence of Argument then, can we imagine them miſtaken in the Apoſtolical Practice?* It is true, they could not well be *miſtaken in the Apoſtolical Practice*; that is, if the Apoſtles adminiſtered both Wine and Water, they could not well miſtake that. Yet this did not hinder, but a Miſtake might creep in as to the Reaſon of this Practice, and ſo the Water might come in time to be thought more neceſſary, than it really was. This I ſay upon Suppoſition; the Water had really been then accounted as neceſſary, as it is now repreſented to be. But I think I have clearly enough ſhewn, it was not thought

(r) *No Reaſon*, p. 9. (ſ) *Defence*, p. 14.

to

to be ſo, but rather to be uſed as an indifferent Rite, ſuch as might lawfully be omitted, though the Wine might not.

What follows concerning the Authentickneſs and Authority of Tradition, has been already conſidered; and therefore I paſs it by here, and proceed to the Reaſons offered, (*u*) *Why the Revival of ſome truly apoſtolical Uſages are not inſiſted upon*, rather than theſe of which the Apoſtles appear not to have ever ſaid any thing. The Reaſon given for not inſiſting upon the Revival of theſe, is ſaid to be, that *though mentioned in Scripture, they are not mentioned as Commands and binding Rules for Practice.* Yet is this no Reaſon, why theſe Practices ſhould not have at leaſt as much Reſpect paid them, as others that are never mentioned in it at all. But more particularly,

(*w*) *As to the ſaluting with a Kiſs*, it is urged that, *though St.* Paul *recommends it, he does not oblige them to practiſe this Ceremony, juſt before their proceeding to the Holy Euchariſt.* If he had, we ſhould not have needed Tradition for it; ſuch an Injunction in Scripture would have put the Obligation out of Diſpute. But as it is; as St. Paul declares it to be an Uſage in his Time, *Rom.* 16. 16. and *Juſtin Martyr* tells us it continued in Uſe in his Days, at their approaching to the Holy Euchariſt; *Tertullian* in his Time, at the Hours (*x*) of Prayer, and the Sacrifice; and a long Time after this St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* Teaches, that in his Time the Deacon made Proclamation, (*y*) calling upon them, to

(*u*) *Defence*, p. 20. (*w*) Ibid. (*x*) Quæ oratio cum divortio ſancti oſculi integra? Quale Sacrificium à quo ſine pace receditur? *Tertul. de Orat. c.* 14.

(*y*) Ἔτι βοᾷ ὁ Διάκονος ἀλλήλοις ἀσπάζεσθε, ἀλλήλοις ἀσπάζωμεθα. Μὴ ὑπολάβῃς τὸ φίλημα ἐκεῖνο σύνηθες εἶναι τοῖς ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς γινομένοις, ἀπὸ ἧθος κοινῶν φιλων· ἐκ ἔστι τοίνυν τοιοῦτον

to *embrace and kiſs one another.* Which *Kiſs*, ſays he, *was not to be looked upon as like thoſe of common Uſage, but as a Token of mutual Reconciliation, and Forgetfulneſs of paſt Injuries or Affronts.* And I ſuppoſe our learned Author will not except to the Authority of the *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*, (z) ordering the Deacon to ſay, *ſalute one another with a holy Kiſs*; and then declaring that *the Clergy were to ſalute the Biſhop, the Lay-men their Brethren, and the Women the Women.* As it is, I ſay, it has much more to be ſaid for it, than theſe other unſcriptural Uſages. But ſays our learned Author, (a) *I have prov'd by unqueſtionable Authority, that our Lord not only drank of the mix'd Cup himſelf, but commanded his Diſciples to do the ſame in Remembrance of him, till his coming again.* But it is one thing to prove, and another to ſay I have proved. It is certain the one of theſe is mentioned in Scripture, and continued accordingly in the Church for ſome conſiderable Time after, And it is as certain, the other is never ſo much as once named, either by our Saviour or his Apoſtles. Nor is it any way proved, that our Saviour, either drank of a mix'd Cup himſelf, or ſo much as once commanded, either his Apoſtles, or any one elſe, to drink of one.

As for the Love-Feaſts before the Euchariſtick Communion, they were only Practice without Precept, as far as it Appears. And as for the Mixture, it has neither Precept, nor Practice, ſo far as appears from any Evidence in the Apoſtolical Age, nor

---

τοιοῦτον τὸ φίλημα· ἀνακίρνησι τὰς ψυχὰς ἀλλήλαις, καὶ πᾶσαν ἀμνησικακίαν αὐτῶν μνησεύεται. *Catech. Myſtag.* v.

(z) Ὁ διάκονος ἀπλῶ πᾶσιν· Ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ἀσπαζέσθωσαν οἱ τοῦ κλήρου τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, οἱ λαϊκοὶ ἄνδρες τοὺς λαϊκούς, αἱ γυναῖκες τὰς γυναῖκας. *Ap. Conſt. l.* 8. c. 11. (a) *Defence*, p. 20.

any

any good Evidence for the Neceſſity of the Water-part of it afterwards.

Laſtly, As for *Deaconeſſes*, (*b*) *their main Buſineſs*, ſays our Author, *was to bring the Women to the Fonts, where they undreſſed, ſtood about them, immerged them in the Water, and then received and dreſſed them. Which Office of theirs being ſince made in a manner uſeleſs, the Reaſon of the Cuſtom expiring, no wonder the Practice ſhould ceaſe with it. Their main Buſineſs*, ſays he, was to bring the Women to the Fonts, and aſſiſt at their Baptiſm. But was it all their Office required of them? He does not ſay it was; and for a very good Reaſon, becauſe he knew very well it was not. (*c*) They were employed beſides, in inſtructing the ignorant Sort of Women, and teaching them their Religion; (*d*) in attending upon them where Men could not be admitted without Offence; and *otherwhiles*, ſays Dr. *Cave*, (*e*) *in viſiting and attending upon Women that were Sick, in conveying Meſſages, Counſels, Conſolations, Relief, (eſpecially in Times of Perſecution, when it was dangerous for the Officers of the Church) to the Martyrs, and them that were in Priſon.* So that there might ſtill be Work enough for them. But I am not pleading for the reſtoring them; but only to ſhew, that they have much more to be ſaid for them than the Mixture; and yet are not thought neceſſary to be reſtored; and by conſequence much leſs is That. Which will certainly hold good, notwithſtanding our learned Author's Flouriſh about

---

(*b*) *Defence*, p. 20. (*c*) Δι' ὧν καὶ πὸς τὴν γυναικῶϊν ἀδιαβλήτως παρεισδύεσθαι ἡ τῆς κυρίας διδασκαλία. *Clem. Alex. Strom.* l. 3. p. 536. (*d*) Ἔστι γὰρ ὁπόταν ἐν ποιν οἰκίαις ἀνδρὶ διάκονον γυναῖξιν ἃ δὺ ασαι πέμπειν διὰ τὰς ἀπίσεις· ἀποστολὰς ἔν γυναῖκα διάκονον. *Conſtit. Apoſt.* l. 3. c. 15.

(*e*) Primitive Chriſtianity, *Part* 1. *Chapter* 8.

the

the *Matter* and Force of a Sacrament, which can no way be proved to belong to the Water. Here by our Author's own (*g*) Confeſſion, our Duty is to *keep cloſe to the Inſtitution*. And this is all we deſire of him; that we may be allowed to communicate in *the Fruit of the Vine*, as our Bleſſed Lord did.

His next Exception about St. *Cyprian*'s Rule, *that only Chriſt is to be hearkned to*, is, This Propoſition was (*h*) *brought to prove the Neceſſity of the Mixture*. But ſince I have ſhewn, that what he inſiſted upon in the Mixture, as of Neceſſity to the Sacrament, was the Wine, and not the Water, I need ſay nothing more to what is urged here.

The Anſwerer had argued, (*i*) that ſince our Saviour had inſtituted the Euchariſt after Supper, but had made no mention of any Water, but only of *the Fruit of the Vine*; *therefore ſuppoſing either of them were to be revived, he ſhould think that to be preferred, of which is moſt undoubted Evidence.* And indeed who would not? However, let us ſee what our learned Author replies to this.

1. He ſays it has been proved, that (*k*) *the Fruit of the Vine does imply a Mixture of Water.* It had need have very good Evidence to prove ſo odd and unaccountable a Propoſition. How is it proved then. From Scripture? Nothing like it. From Apoſtolical Tradition? No. We have no Tradition about it of ſo long ſtanding. Do the Fathers all unanimouſly teſtify it? Not that neither that I can find. How is it then? Why, the Jewiſh *Talmud* written ſeveral hundred Years after our Sa-

(*g*) *Defence*, Page 21.
(*h*) Page 23.
(*i*) *No Reaſon*, Page 13.
(*k*) *Defence*, Page 25.

viour, and compoſed (*l*) with great Indiſcretion and Want of Judgment, (and perhaps not more remarkably ſo in any other Inſtance, than in its odd unaccountable Diſtinction between the *Fruit of the Vine and of the Tree*) aſſerts it. And muſt

(*l*) *The Emperor* Juſtinian *condemns the* Miſna, *that is the Text of the* Talmud, *of which the other Part, the* Gemara, *is the Commentary or Expoſition, as* the Invention of Men, who ſpake only from the Earth, and had nothing Divine in them. Ἐξευρέσιν ἦσαν ἀνδρῶν ἐκ μόνης λαλούντων ἀπὸ γῆς, καὶ θεῖον ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐχόντων οὐδὲν ἕν, *Novel. Conſt.* 146. Sixtus Senenſis *ſpeaking of the Compilers of the* Talmud, *and their Work, ſays*, Cum —— non ſolum contumelias & blaſphemias multas & execrabiles adverſus Chriſtum Deum noſtrum collegiſſent, verum etiam Sanctiones & præcepta plurima conſcripſiſſent, contra ipſam quam profitentur Moſis legem, & contra omne jus Gentium, atque omnem naturæ legem, quam ipſi, utpote homines, ſervare tenentur; viſum eſt ſummis Pontificibus, & aliis Chriſtianis Principibus, ut tam nefariæ doctrinæ lectio, atque uſus, omnibus Judæis, qui ſub ditione Chriſtianorum vivunt interdiceretur. *Biblioth. Sanct. l.* 2. *p.* 125. *Biſhop* Walton *charges it with many fooliſh Traditions.* Nec in ſe ineptæ ſint, quales plurimæ hujuſmodi Talmudicæ. *In Bibl. Proleg. viii. n.* 30. *Mr.* Simonville *teſtifies of the* Talmud, *that it* abounds with great Numbers of unprofitable Queſtions and Hiſtories, or rather Tales framed at Pleaſure, which ſimple People believe to be true, but one of little Judgment may eaſily ſee, they are Allegories invented by Perſons of little Ingenuity, and ſerve only to expoſe the Jews. There are alſo manifeſt Falſities in it. *Elle eſt remplie d'une infinité des queſtions inutiles, & d' hiſtoires, ou plutôt des contes faites à plaiſir, que les ſimples croyent eſtre veritable, mais pour peu de jugement qu'on ait, il eſt aiſé de voir, que ces ſont des allegories inventées par des perſonnes qui n' avoient nul eſprit, & qui ne peuvent ſervir qu' à rendre les Juifs ridicules. Il y à même des fauſſetez manifeſtes dans ce Talmud.* Supplem. aux ceremonies des Juifs, Ch. 2. *And the preſent learned Dean of* Norwich, *Dr.* Prideaux, *teſtifies of this* Talmud, *that however* it is now the *Alcoran* of the *Jews*, into which they have reſolved all their Faith and all their Religion, *yet* it is framed (almoſt with the ſame Impoſture as that of *Mahomet*) out of Doctrines falſely pretended to be brought from Heaven.

must this be more Authentick with us, than our Saviour's own expreſs Words? It will be a very hard Task to prove our Saviour intended it to be ſo. Beſides, were not our Saviour's own Words clear enough to need no Explication, I muſt own I ſhould have more regard for St. *Chryſoſtom*'s Authority, than that of the *Talmud*. Now this eloquent Father is apparently of a contrary Opinion, and declares in as plain Terms as may be, that *the Fruit of the Vine* ſpoken of by our Saviour, *was Wine without Water*. His Words are theſe, (*m*) *When he delivered the Myſteries, he delivered Wine, and when after his Reſurrection he ſpread an ordinary Table without the Myſteries, he made uſe of Wine, he ſays of the Fruit of the Vine:* BUT THE VINE PRODUCES WINE, NOT WATER. Which is a Doctrine ſo plain and full in behalf of our Saviour's Inſtitution, that I may venture to ſay of it, as our learned Author

---

Heaven. *Old and New Teſtament comected. Pt.* i. *B.* v. *p.* 328. *And it is ſurpriſing that this ſhould come at length, to be the only certain Key, for letting us into the true Senſe of our Saviour's Words, and of Power enough to over-rule the plain Intent and Meaning of them. So unaccountable a Diſcovery needs extraordinary Authority to ſupport it. And inſtead of pinning our Faith upon ſuch an unreaſonable Diſtinction as is recommended to us from thence; I cannot but think it much ſafer and better, to follow St.* Paul's *Advice to* Titus, *not to* give heed to Jewiſh Fables, and Commandments of Men that turn from the Truth. *Tit.* i. 14 *Not to add, that the* Oxford *Annotator upon St.* Cyprian's *Sixty Third Epiſtle, has obſerved that it was all one with the* Jews, *whether their Wine were pure or diluted, and cites the Author of the* Toſephos *for his Aſſertion, telling us moreover, that from hence it was* Tho. Aquinas *and* Bonaventure *taught, that the Mixture of Water was not of Neceſſity or the Integrity of the Sacrament.*

(*m*) Δεικνὺς ὅτι ᾗ ἡνίκα τὰ μυστήρια παρέδωκεν, οἶνον παρέδωκε, καὶ ἡνίκα ἀναστὰς χωρὶς μυστηρίων φιλὴν τράπεζαν παρέθηκε, οἴνῳ ἐπέχρητο· ὧν τῶ γεννήματος, φησι, τῆς ἀμπέλου· ἡ ἄμπελος δὲ οἶνον, οὐχ ὕδωρ γεννᾷ. In St. *Matt.* xxvi. 29.

does of St. *Cyprian*, that (*n*) it is *deciſive in this Point*. Farther, this Phraſe, *the Fruit of the Vine*, I think to be ſynonymous with the *Blood of the Grape*. And this Expreſſion we meet with, *Gen.* xlix. 11. without any the leaſt Appearance of a Mixture. *He waſhed his Garments in Wine, and his Clothes in the Blood of Grapes.* And again more plainly, *Deut* xxxii. 14. *Thou didſt drink the pure Blood of the Grape*, and therefore unmixed. So it is in the Original, which the Seventy Tranſlate, *αἷμα σταφυλῆς ἔπιεν οἶνον, he drank Wine the Blood of the Grape.*

2. Our learned Author undertakes to prove it not neceſſary to receive the Sacrament after Supper. Which if he had pleaſed he might have forborn, for it was eaſy to have ſeen that the Anſwerer (*o*) ſuppoſed it, and only inferred from it, that if this Circumſtance, though particularly related in Scripture were not however of perpetual Obligation, much leſs was the Water of which the Scripture makes not the leaſt mention; and that therefore if one of them *were to be revived he ſhould rather think that to be preferred, of which there is moſt undoubted Evidence.* And is not this highly reaſonable?

We come now to the Cuſtom of *Communicating Infants*, which St. *Cyprian* informs us was in Uſe in his Time, and is ſhewn to have obtained (*p*) in the Weſtern Church, till at leaſt the Twelfth Century, and is ſtill amongſt the *Greeks*. And St. *Auguſtin* pleads *an ancient, and he conceives an Apoſtolical Tradition for it. And it is owned by the Eleventh Council of Toledo.* And Scripture was pleaded for it, and with more Appearance of Reaſon

---

(*n*) *Reaſons for reſtoring*, &c. p. 4.
(*o*) *No Reaſon*, p. 13. (*p*) *Page* 15. 16.

than

than can be for the Mixture. Here we are told there is a Threefold Difference between these Two Usages; and all in favour of the Mixture, as being elder, taught to be more necessary, and which continued longer in general Use. I own we hear the Mixture spoke of sooner than this, but we do not hear of it from the Beginning; and we hear of this in the very next Age after we do of that, and about the Middle of it, and if we hear the Wine pleaded for as necessary in the Mixture, we do not hear the like of the Water, so that here the Advantage is over-ruled; and if the Church of *Rome* laid aside this in the Twelfth Century, I believe our Author will not undertake to prove that what they did in that Age, or for some Time before was a Precedent of any Moment. So that if the Mixture had any little Advantage in these Respects, the slender Appearance of Scripture that was urged for the other may fairly be allowed to outweigh it. And could the Application of what is said from Scripture to Children have been clearly proved to belong to them, it would have done it beyond all Dispute.

It was objected, and with very good Reason, (q) *That our Blessed Saviour gives not the least hint of any thing more in the Cup, than the* Fruit of the Vine, *nay that in St.* Matt. xxvi. 29. *he says,* This *Fruit of the* Vine; *as if he had designed purposely to acquaint us, that what he had just given his Disciples to drink, was purely the* Fruit of the Vine, *Wine and nothing else.* And hereupon was argued, *that had our Saviour said upon giving the Cup, I will drink no more of this Water, till I drink it New with you in my Father's Kingdom, every one would have immediately understood the Cup, to be filled with Water, and to have no Wine in it. Why then, when he says, he*

(q) *No Reason*, p. 19.

will

will drink no more of this Fruit of the Vine, *this Wine, why ſhould we not likewiſe underſtand him to mean that it was Wine without Water? That our Saviour adminiſtred in pure Wine, is undoubtedly the plaineſt and moſt natural Senſe of his own Words, which are the beſt and moſt ſure Guide we have to go by. And this I ſhould think were enough to decide the Caſe; inasmuch as it muſt needs imply, either that there was no Water in our Saviour's Euchariſtical Cup; or that if there were, he did not look upon it of that Conſequence, as to make it a neceſſary ſtanding Part of his Inſtitution.* This I apprehend to be plain and clear arguing, and which might juſtly require a direct Anſwer. But our learned Author happened to overlook it all; and ſo it lies yet upon his hand for one.

It was objected farther, (*r*) *That ſuppoſing the Paſchal Cups to be mixt, yet our Saviour's was not neceſſarily ſo; inaſmuch as he did not inſtitute his Euchariſt, till the Paſchal ſupper was over; and ſo what Cup he uſed cannot be inferred from what had gone before.* Whereto is returned for anſwer, (*ſ*) that *'Tis moſt reaſonable to ſuppoſe it the Remainder of what was prepared for the Paſſover.* And is this the undeniable Proof of it we were to expect? *It is moſt reaſonable to ſuppoſe*, that is to ſay, our Author judges it moſt probable. No one can take this for a certain Proof; and yet unleſs we will be ſo forward as to acquieſce in this, we meet with no other.

Next (*t*) our Author is pleaſed to expatiate upon St. *Paul's* divine Inſpiration, as if he had a Mind to inſinuate, that the Anſwerer had taught the contrary. To which End he has thought fit to mutilate the Sentence, and ſtop at

---

(*r*) *No Reaſon*, p. 22. (*ſ*) *Defence*, p. 30. (*t*) *Ibid.*

theſe

these Words, *but only the Apostle St.* Paul *calls it so.* Whereas every one must see the Answerer's Argument lay wholly in the following Words, which had he recited in their proper Place, there could have been no Pretence for this needless Reflection. The whole Sentence is this. (*u*) *And yet after all, I do not find that our Saviour ever gave this Name* [of the Cup of Blessing] *to his Cup; but only the Apostle* St. Paul CALLS IT SO FROM THE BLESSING PRONOUNCED UPON IT, AND NOT WITH RESPECT TO ANY MIXTURE OF WHAT WAS CONTAINED IN IT.

Now if any one besides our Author can find any Thing in the whole Sentence derogatory from St. *Paul's* Apostolical Authority, or his Veracity as a Divine Writer, the Answerer submits to any Penalty he shall be thought fit to have inflicted upon him for it. But this he is in no Fear of. And as to his Argument, what does our learned Author say? Without at all mincing the Matter he grants it to be true. His words are (*w*) *Granting this.* But is this all? No, he proceeds to another Argument, which the Answerer had nothing to do with in this Place; *Granting this,* says he, *his Conclusion will not follow.* What then was the Conclusion? Nothing else but that St. *Paul's* Words did not prove our Saviour's Cup to be the Third Paschal Cup, which has been already granted. So that the Answerer's Conclusion does certainly hold. What then is the Conclusion that does not follow? It is one of our Author's own frameing, and I will give it in his own Words. *If the Eucharistick Cup answered to the* Jewish *Cup of Blessing, which has been made good by sufficient Authority, to which we add that of the*

(*u*) *No Reason,* p. 24. (*w*) *Defence,* p. 30.

learned

learned (x) Hammond, *If it was a Remainder of the Paſchal Proviſion, and the Paſchal Cup of Bleſſing was not without* Mixture; *'twill follow of courſe, that the Euchariſtick Cup was mixt likewiſe. And therefore it's being called* the Cup of Bleſſing, *from the Hymn or* Bleſſing *pronounced, and not from the* Mixture, can do the Anſwerer no Service.

Where are ſeveral Particulars to be noted. For

1. It is ſaid, *It has been made good by ſufficient Authority, that the Euchariſtick Cup anſwered to the* Jewiſh *Cup of Bleſſing.* But by what Authority? Not by St. *Paul's*, for that is given up: But (y) becauſe *the learned Dr. Lightfoot obſerves, that the Third Cup of Wine, was called the Cup of Bleſſing*, and St. *Paul* calls our Lord's Cup by the ſame name: Though it is already acknowledged to have been upon a quite different Account. If this be Proof, what is it a Man may not prove at any time, or by whatſoever Sort of Argument?

2. Dr. *Hammond* is cited to prove that our Saviour's *Euchariſtick Cup anſwered to the* foreſaid *Jewiſh Cup of Bleſſing.* Now beſides that this very learned Writer's Authority is not enough to prove any thing eſſentially neceſſary to Salvation, that does not manifeſtly appear to be ſo by other good Evidence, with ſubmiſſion I conceive our learned Author has been a little too haſty in appealing to Dr. *Hammond*, at leaſt (z) if the Place referred to in his Margin be what he Depends upon. I ſhall give the Reader the whole Note, in the Doctor's own Words, and then leave him to judge whether he can

---

(x) On 1 *Cor.* x. *Annot. E.* (y) *Reaſons*, p. 6.
(z) *Annot.* E. 1 *Cor.* x.

infer

inferr any more from hence, than that our Saviour is here supposed to have called his Cup *a Cup of Blessing*, giving it the same Name or Title, the *Jews* had given their's, *The Jews*, says the Doctor, *used to conclude the Feast wherein the Paschal Lamb was eaten, with a Cup of Wine. This they called* כוס של הלל, ποτήριον ὑμνήσεως, the Cup of Praising, *because they sang an Hymn at that time*, see *Matt.* xxvi. 30. and εὐλογίας, of Blessing; and *from thence the receiving the Wine in the* Sacrament, *being by* Christ *instituted after his Paschal Supper, is here called by that Title. Of the Word* εὐλογῆν, to bless, *see Note on* Matt. xiv. *c.* Here is the whole Note, as I said, and now let the Reader judge, whether there be any thing in it that tends to prove the Necessity of a Mixture, even supposing the *Jewish* Cup to have been Mixt, and whether it does not rather represent our Saviour's Cup to have been a different one from that of the *Jews*, though called by the same Name, the Dr expressly declaring that it was not instituted 'till after Supper. And yet farther, the Dr is here cited somewhat unluckily for our Author, because he plainly declares against him, that *the Cup of Blessing* was so called, [not with any regard to the *Mixture*, but only] upon account of the Hymn sung at that Time.

3. The Eucharistick Cup is supposed to be *a Remainder of the Paschal Provision*. And if it were most probably so, and if that were supposed to be certainly mixed, which will not easily be proved, since even your own Dr. *Lightfoot* acknowledges, as was remarked before, (*a*) that *if a man drinks Wine pure* [in the Passover] *he has performed his Duty*, yet the most that can be pre-

(*a*) *No Reason*, p. 40.

tended to follow from hence, is only a rational Conjecture, which our learned Author may call a certain Proof, if he pleaſes, but can never ſhew it to be ſo.

4. In the laſt Place it is ſaid, *It's being called* the Cup of Bleſſing *from the Hymn, or* Bleſſing *pronounced, and not from the* Mixture, *can do the* Anſwerer *no ſervice.* Which is even harder upon our Author, than his citing Dr. *Hamond* againſt himſelf, for he plainly gives up the Point in debate, which was, that *the Apoſtle calls the Sacramental Cup the Cup of Bleſſing, from the Bleſſing pronounced upon it, and not with reſpect to any Mixture*; only he adds that it *will do the Anſwerer no Service.* Though I am apt to believe, the Anſwerer that thinks freely acknowledging the truth of what he was contending for, and giving up the Citation from St. *Paul*, as not to the purpoſe it was produced for, is granting him all that he did, or could deſire in that reſpect. But I proceed.

The Anſwerer had urged in relation to *Melchizedeck*, that (*b*) *our Saviour being an Antitype to him, who offered Bread and Wine* (AND (*c*) NOTHING ELSE, AS FAR AS WE KNOW) *was more likely to conform to him herein, than to the Cuſtoms of the* Jews, *Suppoſing their Cup in his time to have been mixed, which*, ſays he, *I am not ſure it was*; *and though he had inſtituted his Euchariſt, before they had done Eating, which the Scripture aſſures us he did not.* And to the latter Part of theſe Words nothing is replied. But as to *Melchiſedeck* it is ſaid, His offering *nothing but Bread and Wine, as far as*

(*b*) *No Reaſon*, p. 24.
(*c*) *So it is declared*, Reaſons, *&c.* p. 28.

we

we know, means we don't read that he offered any Bloody Sacrifice. And doubtleſs we do not. But is this all that is naturally implied in the Expreſſion? And does it not as plainly exclude Water or any Sort of Mixture, as Bloody Sacrifices? If it does not, let ſome Exception be ſhewn in the Words, for till that is done, it is an unqueſtionable Truth, that he offered *nothing but Bread and Wine, as far as we know*, not even ſo much as a little Water, for I am ſure I read of none in either the Old or the New Teſtament. Nevertheleſs to make this Expoſition of the Words the more plauſible, St. *Jerome* is cited in the Margin, ſaying to *Evagrius*, not in the 85th, but his 126th Epiſtle, *Neque carnis & ſanguinis victimas immolaverit Melchiſedeck*, neither did he offer Sacrifices of Fleſh and Blood. But if our Author had pleaſed to have given us the whole Sentence, it would have immediately appeared not at all, to his purpoſe. For thus ſays St. *Jerome*, (*d*) *Neither did he offer Sacrifices of Fleſh and Blood, nor take in his right Hand the blood of brute Beaſts, but dedicated the Sacrifice of Chriſt,* IN BREAD AND WINE, *a ſimple and pure Sacrifice.* And to make his Senſe yet more plain, he ſays (*e*) *Therefore the Lord ſays, he will drink no more of this Vineyard, unleſs in his Father's Kingdom.* And again, at another time, (*f*) *As* Melchiſedeck *the King of* Salem *offered Bread and Wine: ſo thou alſo ſhalt offer*

(*d*) Neque carnis & ſanguinis victimas immolaverit, & brutorum animalium ſanguinem dextra ſuſceperit, ſed pane & vino ſimplici puroque ſacrificio Chriſti dedicaverit Sacramentum.

(*e*) Dicit ergo ſe Dominus de hac vineâ nequaquam eſſe bibiturum, niſi regno Patris ſui. *Com. in Matt.* xxvi.

(*f*) Quomodo enim Melchiſedeck rex ſalem obtulit panem & vinum: ſic & tu offeres corpus tuum & ſanguinem, verum panem & verum vinum. In *Pſal.* cix. *And after the ſame manner he ſpeaks again in his Epiſtle,* De virginitate ad Demetriadem.

thy Body and Blood, the true Bread and true Wine. In all which Places is not any Word of any Water. This Type therefore appears not to have consisted of any Thing but pure Wine. But it follows, *'Tis most probable*, Melchisedeck *offered what was generally drunk in those warm Climates, which was, and is still, Wine diluted.* This at best is but Conjecture; and I should be glad to be taught how a bare Conjecture can be a Sufficient Foundation for a Necessary Duty, as this Mixture is asserted to be. However here is a Reason given for it; but such as makes no more to the purpose than the Conjecture it self. *Because those who assisted at the Sacrifice refreshed themselves with the consecrated Entertainment.* For it has never been proved, nor I suppose so much as pretended, that People cannot refresh themselves with Wine, unless *it* have Water mixt among it. I am sure when the *Psalmist* affirms, that (g) *Wine maketh glad the Heart of Man*, he says not one Word of any Mixture necessary to that purpose. And I appeal to any one who has ever drunk a Glass of Wine, whether it has not at least as much Refreshment in it without Water as with it. This Reason therefore, if I may call it a Reason, will never hold. Besides, it is not certain that diluted Wine was so constantly drunk amongst the *Jews* as it is here supposed to be. This very Instance of *Melchisedeck's offering Bread and Wine*, is a considerable Proof of it. And we have another remarkable one in the New Testament, at the Marriage-Feast in *Cana* of *Galilee*, where our Saviour turned the Water into Wine. For we not only hear nothing of any Water mixt with it; but the Master of the Feast's calling for the Bridegroom, and telling him he had *kept the good*

(g) *Psalm* civ. 15.

Wine

Wine to the End of the Feaſt, St. *Joh.* ii. 13. ſeems to imply, that he drank his Wine pure and unmixt, inaſmuch as otherwiſe he would not have been ſo ſenſible of the Excellency of it. It follows again, *Suppoſing, which can never be proved.* What, not when the Scripture plainly declares it was Wine, without hinting at any Mixture? But what is it we are to ſuppoſe? Only that the Scripture ſpake plainly, and *Melchiſedeck* ſacrificed in undiluted Wine. This I confeſs is a very eaſy Suppoſition, and what I can moſt readily come into; but what is to be inferred from it? 'Tis this; *There is no Neceſſity the Type and Antitype ſhould agree, or be the ſame in every Particular.* Suppoſe this too, yet we are as much at a Loſs for the Neceſſity of the Mixture as ever. I thought it was to have been clearly *proved*, that the Antitype did not anſwer the Type in all Particulars; and this I am ſure ought in Reaſon to have been done. But inſtead of this we are only taught it is not neceſſary that it ſhould. Which if I ſhould likewiſe ſuppoſe, it will never follow from hence that the one did not really and in fact anſwer to the other. The ſhort of the Matter is, that though Types don't anſwer like Tallies, that is *in every Particular*, as our Author juſtly (*b*) argues, yet the main fundamental Point, or Particular, wherein they are neceſſarily deſigned to agree, can admit of no Addition of any other Typical Symbol, to make them differ in that, nor is the Antitype any way to differ from the Type in this reſpect. And ſo *Melchiſedeck's* Bread and Wine did moſt emphatically typify the Euchariſtick Elements. And

(*b*) *Defence*, p. 32.

what

what if *Joshua* were a Type of our Blessed Saviour, in bringing the *Israelites* into *Canaan*, in like manner as our Saviour procured a far bettes Inheritance for all his faithful Disciples, and in nothing else? For we are not told of any Thing else wherein our Saviour was typified by him. And if our Saviour did not answer to him in any other respect, wherein he was not typified by him, can any one think this an Argument to prove that our Saviour, as Antitype to *Melchisedeck*, was not to answer him, in what he was peculiarly intended to typify? This would be thought an unusual way of arguing in any other Case. For if *Malchisedeck* did not typify our Lord in any other respect, there is not the least Pretence to question, but he did in this; nor by consequence, but that our Saviour was a true Antitype of him in it. Though this is more than was incumbent upon me to prove, it being enough for my purpose, if there were no more in it, than that I could say the contrary could not be proved. So that here is a Failure on both hands, inasmuch as *Melchisedeck* plainly appears to have been a Type of our Saviour as to the Cup; and besides it would answer my End, if it had been only that it could not be proved he was not. *Joseph. pag. 7.*

St. *Cyprian* mentions *Noah* likewise (*i*) as a Type of our Saviour, and says of him in so many words, that *he represented our Lord's Passion in drinking, not Water but Wine.* That he should

(*i*) *Ep. ad Cæcil. 63.* Invenimus enim & in Genesi circa Sacramentum in Noe hoc idem præcurrisse, & figuram Dominicæ passionis illic extitisse, quod vinum bibit. *Et paulo post*, Quod Noe typum futuræ veritatis ostendens, non aquam, sed vinum biberit, & sic imaginem Dominicæ passionis expresserit.

drink

drink not Water, but pure Wine was neceſſary to the End, for which he was drawn in to drink at all. And that it was Wine only that he drank, appears too plainly from the unhappy Effect it had upon him.

Again, when it is ſaid (*k*) *He waſhed his Garments in Wine, and his Cloaths in the Blood of the Grape*; and again, (*l*) *Thy Garments like him that treadeth in the Winefat. I have troden the Winepreſs alone*; theſe and other the like Types muſt neceſſarily ſink in their myſtical Importance, (*m*) if the Cup repreſented by them, together with the Blood ſhed upon the Croſs, could not be duly expreſſed without diluted Wine. And ſo much the rather ſtill, ſince the particular Element it muſt be diluted with, was peculiarly ſeparated by the divine Author of all our Chriſtian Myſteries, for the Matter of the other Sacrament of Baptiſm; as has. been noted before.

Had the *Drink-offering* amongſt the *Jews* been uſed to be drunk, I ſhould have thought it the livelieſt Type of our Saviour's Blood, and of his Cup, of any that we have. And though I do not obſerve in Scripture that any of it was ever drunk; and Dr. *Lightfoot* teaches that it was (*n*) *poured upon the Foundation of the Altar*, yet this being a neceſſary attendant (*o*) upon a Burnt or a Peace-Offering, the Cup in the Euchariſt ſeems not improperly to ſucceed in the room of it. And we all know Wine is as expreſly ſpecified, in ſimple and plain terms, to be the Liquor in-

---

(*k*) *Gen.* xlix. 11. (*l*) *Iſ.* lxiii. 2, 3.

(*m*) Nunquid rubicunda veſtimenta aqua poteſt facere? aut in torculari aqua eſt, quæ pedibus calcatur, vel prelo exprimitur? *B. Cypr. Epiſt.* 63.

(*n*) *Temple Service*, c. 8. §. 5. (*o*) *Numb.* xv, 4, &c.

joyned

joyned for theſe *Drink-offerings*, as that there ſhould be any *Drink-Offerings* at all. And can we imagine that the Divine Wiſdom, which explains the Nature of God's Worſhip, in ſo punctual a manner as it did all along to that People, would have ſuch a reſerved Meaning as that Water of which there is no more mention than there is of the *Jeſuit's Bark*, ſhould be put into it? Or how ſhould ſuch a dull People as the *Jews* are always repreſented to be, be expected to find it out, if it had been ſo? And if no Water belonged to the Inſtitution of the Drink-Offerings in their other Sacrifices, how can it be conceived that our Saviour would not have more regard, in the Inſtitution of the Euchariſt, to God's own Appointment, than to the Paſchal Cup, which was of the Jews own Invention? and if not the ſame with this muſt imply, either that the Water was a Matter of Indifference, or elſe that they kept to God's known Ordinance, to offer as he had commanded them. And by conſequence the Paſchal Cup muſt have been perfect to all Intents and Purpoſes in its own Nature without any Mixture in it, becauſe directly agreeable to the general Inſtitution of all Offerings of that kind. And if that were ſufficient to anſwer the End of it's Uſe without a Mixture, why not the Euchariſtical Cup too?

So that as far as we may argue from the Types that occur in the old Teſtament, they appear plainly to be againſt the Neceſſity of any Mixture in this ſacred Cup.

(*p*) *The next Attack*, ſays our Author, *is upon the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions.* But as to what was ſaid about them, I cannot apprehend he has offered any

(*p*) *Defence*, p. 33.

Thing

Thing that invalidates the Anſwerer's Objection; and therefore I might leave That to ſhift for it ſelf, till a more ſatisfactory Reply can be made to it. But I will take leave to obſerve, what the Anſwerer ſhould have before taken notice of, from the *Reaſons for Reſtoring*, &c. (q) that it is there freely owned, theſe *Conſtitutions wont anſwer quite up to the Title* (that is that they cannot be proved to be written till at leaſt two, perhaps three hundred years after the time of the Apoſtles;) *yet that they contain a great Part of the Worſhip and Diſcipline of the primitive Church, is beyond Queſtion.* (Which they might very well do, and yet be out in the Matter of the Mixture; or at leaſt without being able to prove it eſſential.) *And that their Antiquity is conſiderable*, (but far from the Beginning.) And what now can be made of this? Theſe Conſtitutions come a great while after the times of the Apoſtles; and I may juſtly add, the Authority of them has been always diſputed; and at beſt they only *contain a great Part of the Worſhip and Diſcipline of the Primitive Church.* And muſt not he now be very dull, that cannot ſee here a plain Proof of the abſolute Neceſſity of the Mixture? I am ſure he muſt be exceedingly quick-ſighted that can.

But if theſe will not do, perhaps what comes next may prove more effectual; which is this, (r) *To the Authority for the Mixture, cited from the Liturgies of St.* Baſil *and St.* Chryſoſtom, *the Anſwerer takes notice that Dr.* Cave *complains of them as interpolated, and* Du Pin *reckons them either ſpurious or doubtful.* Is this all then that he complains of? Our Author does not ſay this; for every one knows, he complains, that they

(q) *Reaſons*, p. 6. (r) *Defence*, p. 33.

come too late to prove the Neceſſity of an Uſage ſaid to have been taught, ſome hundreds of Years before them; eſpecially conſidering what countenance ſome Doctrines, not duly founded, had gained in much leſs time, But ſuppoſe there had been no other complaint, than of the Interpolation or Spuriouſnes of them; does our learned Author diſprove this? He does not attempt it; but only ſays, *this ſuppoſes the greater Part of them to be genuine.* Their being *Spurious or Doubtful*, I am much afraid will never prove, or ſo much as ſuppoſe, any Part of them, much leſs the greater Part *to be genuine.* But now ſuppoſe them only *interpolated*, what are we to inferr from hence? Why, only that *the greater Part of them muſt be genuine.* But what if the greater Part ſhould prove interpolated, or at leaſt be thought to be ſo? This will never admit of moſt of them as genuine. And yet if we ſhould be ſo yielding, as to ſuppoſe this too for the preſent; does it prove that any Thing, and particularly that the Mixture, can be proved from them to be of indiſpenſable Neceſſity? I doubt, not. But the Genuine Parts of them *may be diſtinguiſhed eaſily enough, by the Doctrine and Practice of the Church in St.* Baſil *and St.* Chryſoſtom's *Time.* Theſe Liturgies, have been already conſidered and ſhewn not to anſwer. But here I would ask farther; can we have a better way to judge of St. *Baſil*'s Liturgy than by St. *Chryſoſtom's*, or of St. *Chryſoſtom*'s, than by his own Words upon another Occaſion? I mean in the Place cited before, where he poſitively declares that our Saviour, both at the Euchariſt, and again after his Reſurrection made uſe of *Wine the Fruit of the Vine*, ἡ δὲ ἄμπελος ἐστιν, οὐχ ὕδωρ γεννᾷ, *but it is Wine* AND NOT WATER *that is produced of the Vine*, in St. *Matt.* 26. 29. How to reconcile this Aſſertion to the Neceſſity of

of the Mixture, will need more Skill than I can pretend to; or to his Liturgy if ſuppoſed to teach any ſuch thing.

Now we come to the two Councils inſiſted upon; and the firſt is (*f*) of *Carthage*, commonly called the *Third*. Which orders, that *Nothing ſhould be offered, but Bread and Wine mixt with Water*, quam ipſe Dominus tradidit, *as our Lord himſelf appointed*, ſays our learned Author; but which is in truth, *which our Lord himſelf* DELIVERED; which is of far leſs Importance, and does not imply an Appointment, unleſs it can be proved that our Lord uſed the Water as a Matter of Neceſſity, not of Indifference. But he proceeds, *Is not ſo unanimous a Reſolution for the Neceſſity of the* Mixture, *is not the Teſtimony of a* whole Synod, *conſiderable Evidence?* Be it ſo, yet I always thought *conſiderable*, and ſufficient Evidence, had been very different. In our own Laws, the Teſtimony of one Man of good Underſtanding, and unqueſtionable Credit and Reputation, cannot be denied to be *conſiderable Evidence*, but yet it is out of doubt that it is not ſufficient to convict another of Treaſon. And this learned Gentleman knows very well we are ſeeking after, not *conſiderable*, but *ſufficient* Evidence; which he does not profeſs this to be.

The other is the Council in *Trullo*, held at *Conſtantinople* near ſeven hundred Years after our Saviour. And I am perſuaded he will not ſay all the Determinations of Councils made before this are right and neceſſarily obliging, and eſpecially that they are ſo to all People. But to come to the Canon as it lies before us, the Thirty Second,

(*f*) *Page* 34.

(*t*) *If*

(t) *If I were to take the latter definitive Part of this Canon alone*, says the Answerer *I should, and so I suppose would any one else, take it to be an undoubted Prohibition of the Use of Water in the holy Cup.* And then he puts down the Words; *If any Bishop or Priest does not officiate according to the Apostles Appointment, and having mixed Water with the Wine, does thus offer the unblemished Sacrifice, let him be deposed, as one that represents the Mystery imperfectly, and innovates upon what was delivered.* And does our Author now say, that the Words of the Canon are not rightly quoted? No, nothing of this. Or that they are not rightly translated by the Answerer? Not that neither. How then? Giving an Account of this Part of the Canon he says, (u) *Therefore if any Bishop or Priest* HAVING MIXT (AS THE ANSWERER INTERPRETS) *Water with the Wine, does thus offer the unblemished Sacrifice*, &c. *that is, If any Bishop or Priest stands off from the* Armenian *Heterodoxy; if they presume to govern themselves by the Practice and Authority of St.* Chrysostom *and St.* Basil, *of all the famous Bishops of the World, and particularly of St.* James *first Bishop of* Jerusalem; *If they are thus bold to follow these Authorities, and mix Water with the Wine, let them be deposed*, &c. *What is this but to make the* Definitive Part *to contradict all the Reasons for forming it, and fly in the Face of the noble Authorities alledged? This is in effect no better than to put up the Council in a dark Room* &c, But now to lay aside the Oratory and Rhetorick of this florid Paragraph, and come to the Question; Is here one Word of Exception against the Answerer's Account of this Part of the Canon? I cannot find the least Intimation of his not giving a true State of the Words as

(t) *No Reason*, p. 28. (u) *Defence*, p. 39.

they

they are tranſmitted down to us. He ſays indeed, HAVING MIXT, *as the Anſwerer interprets*, as if he were willing his Reader ſhould think there was Artifice in the Tranſlation of the Word Μιγνὺς, yet he does not ſay there is, and he certainly knows there is not. But it follows, *This is in effect no better than to put up the Council in a dark Room, and expound them into Nonſenſe and Diſtraction. This is Riding at full ſpeed out of their Wits; what Fever or Phrenſy can exceed it? And yet the Anſwerer is pleaſed to ſay, that forbidding the* MIXTURE, *is the natural and genuine Tranſlation of the Words.* And I refer it to our Author's own Conſcience, whether what the *Anſwerer* ſays, be not unqueſtionably true, and do deſire him to give a more exact Tranſlation of the Words, than he has done. And if our Author cannot do this, I muſt beg of him to conſider how little the Anſwerer has deſerved all the Rhetorick that is beſtowed upon him. Which I perſuade my ſelf he would not have met with, but for want of a better Anſwer. And yet after all I cannot ſee that here is any Thing like an Anſwer to what had been propoſed. The Anſwerer had owned he could not make the Canon rightly conſiſtent with it ſelf. Here therefore he wanted to be helped out; and might accordingly have expected that our learned Author would have done it for him. But he finds his Hopes fail him. He had inquired farther, upon Suppoſition of the Canon's happening to be inconſiſtent with it ſelf, *What Uſe can be made of it? Or what will you infer from the former Part of it, the contrary to which may not be as naturally deduced from the latter?* And it is no Reſolution of either of theſe Inquiries, nor will he find himſelf ever the wiſer for being told, that (x) *Theſe two Hundred Biſhops broke out of*

(x) *Defence*, p. 40.

ſome

ſome Madhouſe, and ran into the Emperor's Palace, where His Majeſty was ſo kind as to let them ſit with the Character of a Council.

The Argument from *Nicephorus* was only offered to be conſidered of; and if it be not ſatisfactory, it will not be wanted.

Next, the *Anſwerer* is deſired *to remember* (*y*), *we have the Authority of this Council to prove the Paſſages for the* Mixture *in St.* Baſil's *and St.* Chryſoſtom's *Liturgies not interpolated.* That is to ſay, the Council's citing them for their Uſe in the Year DCLXXX, proves that no Alteration had been made in them, from the Time that thoſe two Fathers lived. And who can ſtand out againſt ſuch Proof. Thus it had been ſaid before from the Canon, that St. (*z*) *James*'s Liturgy was on their ſide; but if our learned Author be really of Opinion that this Liturgy was compoſed by that Apoſtle, I would beg of him to give himſelf the Trouble of anſwering the Exceptions brought againſt it by Dr. *Cave*, Mr. *Du Pin*, and other learned Men, to ſhew that it was not compiled 'till ſeveral Hundreds of Years after the Apoſtles Age. The Council's appealing to this Liturgy, as made by St. *James*, I take to be a good Evidence that they did not act infallibly.

The laſt Inquiry about this Council is, (*a*) how this XXXII Canon *comes to be ſo much more inſiſted upon, than ſeveral others that have the ſame Authority, and yet are not thought neceſſary to be reduced to Practice.* And hereto our learned Author replies (*b*) in ſeveral Particulars.

1. Others breaking one Canon will not be a Licence for our breaking another. Which I conceive to be quite beſides the Mark; inaſmuch as the Anſwerer did not any way ſpeak of breaking

(*y*) *P.* 42. (*z*) *P.* 39. (*a*) *No Reaſon*, p. 32. (*b*) *Def.* p. 42.

them,

them, but only he looked upon them as antiquated, and yet not thought neceſſary to be revived. As I believe our Author will agree they are not. And then the Queſtion falls naturally in, How comes this to be ſo much more obligatory than any of thoſe, though Enacted by the ſame Authority? Beſides, that this Part of the Church has nothing to do with them.

2. *Theſe Reſtraints point only upon Branches of Diſcipline.* If I thought it worth the while, it were eaſy to ſhew, that *This* Canon points upon Diſcipline as much as ſome of them.

3. *'Tis not impoſſible, but that theſe* Trullan *Fathers may have laid their Hands upon ſome natural Rights, ſome unalienable Privileges.* And is it then more impoſſible that they ſhould have exceeded their Bounds in relation to the *Mixture?*

4. *This Council is cited only for Evidence, not for binding Authority.* So we are told now, but no one could have collected it from what was ſaid in the (c) *Reaſons.* Where the Council of *Carthage* is cited, not as teſtifying, but decreeing. And then follows this Canon juſt in the ſame manner; and after ſome Account of the preceeding Part of it, the definitive Part is noted with a particular Mark, from whence any one would naturally conclude it to be cited for the ſake of that. But now the Scene is changed, and it is not the Authority of the Council, but it's Teſtimony, that is to be attended to; *And 'tis hoped the Teſtimony of* 200 *Biſhops is good Proof of Matter of Fact, and may be allowed to paſs in a Chriſtian Court.* Moſt certainly in a Matter they were Eye-witneſſes of. But if twice two Hundred were to appear in *Weſtminſter-Hall,* to teſtifie for a Matter of Fact done ſix Hundred Years before any of them were born, they could never expect to carry the Cauſe.

(c) *Pag.* 7.

Yet

Yet these, I hope, are Christian Courts. Or if our Author is for appealing rather to an Ecclesiastical Assembly, I believe he will not deny, that in all Councils, Matters are carried by a Majority of Votes, and sometimes by a very small Majority; and withal, that the Majority are not always the best, the honestest and learnedest Men. And when they are not, it cannot be avoided, but both their Canons, and Testimony too, will be in great Danger of being sometimes found erroneous. I will give but one Instance, and leave it to our learned Author himself to be the Judge. In the very next Age after that wherein the Council sate in *Trullo*, another was convened of 367 Bishops, a much larger Number than those at *Constantinople*; I mean, the second Council at *Nice*. Which consisting of so many Fathers, nevertheless not only (*d*) decreed the Worship of Images, and anathematized such as refused to admit of them; but taught (*e*) the Honour paid to our Blessed Saviour's Image to terminate in himself; and pleaded for it *the Traditions of the Apostles and Fathers, and the Declarations of the Holy Oracles themselves*. Here therefore I ask; whether the Testimony of these, near twice two Hundred Bishops, *be good Proof for Matter of Fact, and may be allowed to pass in a Christian Court?* Here our Author must grant, either that the Worship of Images is derived from our Saviour and his Apostles, or that the Evidence of this much greater Number of Fathers is not good, and will not pass in a Christian Court.

(*d*) *Act.* iii.

(*e*) Τὴν δὲ εἰκόνα χειρὶ τῇ ἀληθινῇ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν, καὶ τὰς ἀνέκαθεν ἀποστολικὰς τε καὶ πατερικὰς παραδόσεις, καὶ τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν λογίων ἐκφωνήσεις, ὅπη τιμὴ καὶ σεβασμιότητι τῇ εἰκονιζομένῳ, προσκυνεῖσθαι καὶ τιμᾶσθαι, ψήφοις ἀπάσαις ἐπεκύρωσέ τε καὶ ἐπεσφραγίσατο. *Phot. Nomoc. Synod.* vii. *apud Justell. Cod. Can.* p. 1153.

There

There were (*f*) alſo two farther Aſſertions in relation to this Council. *Firſt*, That *whatſoever the Doctrine of the Council were in this Point, it cannot outweigh our Saviour's Inſtitution.* To which no Anſwer is made. The other, That *Wine was the proper Repreſentative of our Saviour's Blood, which was to be denoted by the Cup, but could not with any Propriety be expreſſed by Water, becauſe having no Reſemblance of it.* Whereto it is replied, (*g*) that *ſince Wine is the main Ingredient, the Repreſentation is as lively, as if the Cup had been uncompounded.* Where it is not ſo much as inſinuated, that the Blood is the better repreſented by the Mixture. Indeed it is ſomewhat the worſe; becauſe the paler and thinner the Liquor grows, the leſs like it is to Blood, though the Reſemblance may not be totally deſtroyed. It is added, (*h*) that both St. *Cyprian* and the *Trullan* Council give us to underſtand, That *the Mixture has a farther Significancy, and repreſents the Blood and Water that flowed from our Saviour's Side.* But it is certain our Saviour himſelf ſays nothing like this. As he mentions no Mixture, it is not imaginable, he ſhould mention any Signification of it; and accordingly he ſpeaks of nothing, but the *Fruit of the Vine*, nor of any Thing elſe to be repreſented by it, but his Blood, which is beſt ſhewn forth without a *Mixture*. But this is not all. *Over and above*, ſays he, *the Council tells us from St.* Chryſoſtom, *that adminiſtring without the Mixture was a direct Contradiction to Apoſtolical Tradition.* By which Words I underſtood, and I ſubmit to the Reader's Judgment, whether any one elſe would not underſtand, that the Council ſaid St. *Chryſoſtom* had taught that not to put Water into the Wine was

(*f*) *No Reaſon*, p. 33 (*g*) *Defence*, p. 44. (*h*) *Ibid.*

to contradict Apostolical Tradition. But here I must take the Liberty to say I find my self doubly mistaken. For *First*, nothing can be plainer than that St. *Chrysostom* is here affirmed to have taught, that *the Contradiction to Apostolical Tradition* complained of, was the Practice of the *Hydroparastatæ*, in administring without Wine. Which is very different from teaching the Administring without Water to be a Contradiction to Apostolical Tradition; though that is what our Author's Words most naturally import; and is indeed what is here contended for. But besides, *Secondly*, Neither does the Council in the following Words, where it speaks more plainly of the Water, declaring that St. *Chrysostom* taught his Church to mix Water with the Wine, hereby intimating the Mixture of Blood and Water that came from our Saviour's Sides; neither here, I say, does the Council affirm that St. *Chrysostom* declared the Mixture to be necessary by Virtue of *Apostolical Tradition*, but only that he shewed it, that is, themselves collected it from his Practice (*i*). So that by this time it is apparent, the Water-Mixture is not taught by St. *Chrysostom* to be necessary, and the Neglect of it to be contrary to Apostolical Tradition as our Author's Words teach it to be.

(*i*) The Words of the Council are these; Τῇ γὰρ παπᾷ ἡμῶν ὑδροπαρασταθῶν αἱρέσεως παλαιᾶς ὑπαρχούσης, οἱ ἀνὴρ ὅσιος μόνῳ τῷ ὕδατι ἐν τῇ οἰκείᾳ θυσίᾳ κεχρῆσθαι, ἀνασκευάζων ὅπως ὁ θεοτόκος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀφράγμου τῆς παιδοποιίας αἱρέσεως διαδοχὴν, καὶ δεικνὺς ὡς ἐξ ἐναντίας τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς ἴσταται παραδόσεως, τὸ εἰρημένον καθεσκεύασε λόγον. Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τῇ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἔνθα τὴν ποιμαντικὴν ἐνεχειρίσθη ἡγεμονίαν, ὕδωρ οἶνῳ μιγνύναι παρέδωκεν, ἵνικα τὴν ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν ὁπλελεῖσθαι δείσειεν, τὴν ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς τοῦ λυτρωτοῦ ἡμῶν, καὶ σωτῆρος χεισθεῖσαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὄξ αἵματος καὶ ὕδατος κρᾶσιν παραδεικνὺς, ἥτις εἰς ζωοποίησιν παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἐξεχύθη ἀπολύτρωσιν.

Farther,

Farther, the Author of the *Reasons* having said, That *Wine is only mentioned in Scripture, because it was the principal Ingredient*, the Answerer complained that this was a *beggirg the Question*, (*k*) and gave this Reason of his Assertion, that *it is strange to think, that all the necessary Ingredients of the Institution should not be declared, for the Information of those that were to be concerned in it, but could not be expected to perform it aright, without being first taught all Things that necessarily pertain to it.* And really I cannot but think this to be a great Truth. Yet now we are taught, That

1. (*l*) *There might be something concealed at the Institution, which was afterwards communicated at the sending of the Holy Ghost.* A Pretence so far as concerns the Mixture for which I cannot possibly imagine any Sort of Ground. And indeed, had our Saviour designed to suppress any Part of his Institution, 'till the Coming of the Holy Ghost, we may be sure it would have been declared then, that we might know it. Which since it was not, there is no Room to doubt but he himself plainly declared all that was necessary. It is true, our Saviour tells his Disciples, St. *Joh.* xvi. 12. *I have yet many Things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now*; namely, because of the Difference that was between these designed Revelations, and what had been taught and practised under the *Jewish* Law. But sure the Mixing a little Water with the Sacramental Wine was no such confounding Mystery, as they might not be intrusted with it. Especially, if they had been so constantly accustomed to a mixt Cup in the Paschal Feast, as is here over and over positively affirmed. We are asked,

---

(*k*) *No Reason*, p. 34. (*l*) *Defence*, p. 45.

 2. (*m*) *Did*

2. (*m*) *Did not the Diſciples bring in the Proviſion*, and make ready the Paſſover? *Were they not all preſent at the Entertainment, and received Part of it? How then could they be unacquainted with what paſſed before them, and be ignorant of the Ingredients in the Sacramental Cup?* This by the way is a full Declaration, that the ſuppoſed Mixture was not one of thoſe *ſignificant Diſcoveries* that *they could not* then *bear*; becauſe they are here preſumed to be perfectly acquainted with it. But farther, Does our learned Author really believe, that the Euchariſt was inſtituted for none of our Lord's Diſciples, but thoſe only that lived and converſed with him, and were preſent at his laſt Supper? If he does not, he muſt needs ſee, there were others that in all the Succeeding Ages of the Church would need to be informed of the Rites required of them in this ſacred Ordinance. And I muſt ſtill ſay, *it is ſtrange to think that all the neceſſary Ingredients of it ſhould not be declared* for *Their* Inſtruction. And I beg our learned Author himſelf to tell me if it be not. The ſhort of the Matter is this, and I pray a clear Anſwer to it, (*n*) *There is all the Reaſon in the World to believe, that had our Saviour deſigned, his Followers ſhould celebrate the Euchariſt in Water, as well as Wine, he would have told them ſo. And ſince he has not thought fit to do it, it may juſtly be concluded he either uſed no Water in the Euchariſtick Cup, or at leaſt not as any neceſſary Part of it.*

But what comes now is very much to the purpoſe, and deſerves to be well attended to, if it be any way made out. And it is that (*o*) *the Mixture is not without Authority from Scripture.* This I ſhould be glad to ſee well proved; but how is it to be done? Why, *the Cup*

(*m*) *Defence*, p. 46. (*n*) *No Reaſon*, p. 35. (*o*) *Defence*, p. 46.

our

our Saviour drank is called the Fruit of the Vine. I grant it; but this will never prove there was any thing in the Cup but Wine. Yes, *the Jews at their Paſsover called it* the Fruit of the Vine, *tho' 'twas mixed with Water.* How is this proved? It needs no Proof, according to our Author; for he ſays the *Anſwerer grants it.* Though I doubt this is running too faſt; for the Anſwerer does not grant it, but only ſuppoſes it for Argument ſake. And what can be reaſonably inferred from ſuch a Suppoſition, were there Reaſon for it? Why, *Our Saviour was a Jew, and did he not ſpeak the Language of his own Country? Did he not inſtitute the Holy Euchariſt, upon a Reſemblance with the Paſchal Solemnity? Have we not then great Reaſon, to conclude that what our Saviour calls the* Fruit of the Vine, *had a Mixture of Water in it?* Now here it is my Turn to put Queſtions, and I would therefore deſire to know; Did our Saviour Inſtitute this holy Ordinance for the *Jews* only, and not for the *Gentiles* too? And would he not do it then in Language plainly intelligible by them as well as the *Jews?* Did he inſtitute the holy Euchariſt, upon a Conformity to the Paſchal Solemnity in every thing? Particularly did he make it unlawful for Chriſtians to have *Leaven in their Houſes* at the time of Communicating: or require them to eat *bitter Herbs* together with the Euchariſt? Did he order it to be eaten by our Families or Houſes, and only at *Jeruſalem?* At one only certain time of Year, and of the Day too? If not, how then can it be any more proved, that he enjoyned us a *mixt Cup* even upon the Suppoſition of their having always uſed one? If this be all the Authority the *Mixture* has from Scripture, it will be long enough before the Eſſentiality of it can be ſhewn from thence.

The

The Anſwerer had aſſerted *a great (p) Difference between reporting the Uſe of a Rite, and the firſt Inſtitution of it, where Direction is to be given for perpetual Performance of it.* Here ſays our learned Author, *(q) our Anſwerer ſeems ſomewhat dark and involved.* But how *dark and involved?* Are not the Words plain and eaſily intelligible? Eſpecially of thoſe that next follow be added to them. *Here the whole of it is neceſſary to be plainly and clearly deſcribed, and the ſeveral Branches of it particularized, that each one may know, how he is to behave himſelf in relation to it. Howſoever in the other Caſe, it may ſometimes ſuffice, to ſpeak only of ſome principal Part of it, paſſing by the reſt, when well known to belong to it.* This I think is plain enough, and perhaps too plain to be anſwered. Why elſe does our learned Author not make a juſt Reply to it? He undertakes indeed to *ſet open the Meaning ſomewhat farther to the Reader.* But in what manner has he done it? He ſays nothing more to it, but goes off to the fore-mentioned Queſtions. Which how much they are to the purpoſe, I beg of him a little to conſider.

The Water, he ſays, *is not* EXPRESSLY *mentioned by the Evangeliſts.* But if he pleaſe to look again into the Anſwerer, he will find that he does not own them to have given *any manner of Hint* concerning it; which is a different Thing from ſaying *it is not expreſsly mentioned by the Evangeliſts.* For this looks as if it might be fairly inferred from their Doctrine, though not *expreſsly mentioned* in it. But where the Words are from which it may be thus inferred, is a great Secret, and like to continue ſo.

(p) *No Reaſon*, p. 35. (q) *Defence*, p. 46.

But

But to proceed, (r) *This Objection*, says he, (namely of the Water's not being mentioned *in Scripture*, for so it should have been, and not by *the Evangelists* only) *being foreseen by the Author of* the Reasons, *he replied, That when* Moses *sprinkled the People with the Blood of the Covenant, there is no Mention of Water being mix'd with it; And the Apostle assures us*; that *Moses* took the Blood with Water, *Heb.* ix. 19. Yes, and not only with Water, but with *Scarlet Wooll and Hyssop, and sprinkled the Book and all the People.* So that here is as much said for the Scarlet Wooll and the Hyssop, as for the Water, but nothing for any of them to our purpose. For I would very gladly be informed; Were these things ever publickly enjoyned by Almighty God? Or were they given privately in Charge to *Moses?* Or did he use them of his own Head, as indifferent uncommanded Rites? When these Questions are resolved, it will be time enough to consider what is urged from this Text. And in the mean while I am sure, nothing can be collected from it, that can be of any Service to our Author, or his Cause.

But says our Author, (s) *That our Saviour has declared his Appointment, that the Apostles saw and practised it, and that the Church has all along understood this Appointment for the Mixture, I have already proved.* And whether I have not more fully proved the contrary, I submit to the Readers Determination. And as to the Flourishes that follow, about the Inspiration of the Fathers, who lived so long as Prophecying and Miracles lasted, all I have to say is, that either those Fathers were infallibly inspired, or they were not. If they were, why are not their Writings allowed to be of equal Au-

(r) *Defence, Page* 47. (s) *Page* 48.

thority

thority with the Holy Scripture? If they were not infallibly inſpired, why ſhould as great Streſs be laid upon their Sayings, as if they had been ſo? Suppoſing they had been as preſſing for the Mixture, as they are pretended to have been, either their Doctrines muſt have been as Authentick in all reſpects as thoſe of Scripture, and then they ought to have been put into the Canon, and the Church is highly to blame for not doing it. Or elſe thoſe muſt be highly to blame now, who go off from the Rule of Scripture, and ſet them up as a ſufficient Foundation for ſuch Duties as the Scripture knows nothing off.

Yet if we have not ſufficient Chriſtian Authorities for the Mixture, we muſt go to the *Jews* for it, rather than be without ſo neceſſary a Part of our Religion, and muſt learn from their *Talmud*, and from an abſurd Diſtinction in it, what we cannot learn from the Bible, and all the Directions there given us. But what Sort of Evidence the *Talmud* is, I have (*t*) already obſerved; and what Weight can any way be laid upon ſo ſenſeleſs a Diſtinction, as that betwixt the *Fruit of the Tree and of the Vine*, I leave to every one to conſider.

But our Author tells us, (*u*) *the Anſwerer is willing to admit the Talmud*, that is, though he had juſt before excepted to it as not a competent Evidence in the Caſe, he is willing however for Argument ſake, to ſuppoſe it *for the preſent*, to be good Authority. And what Advantage can be hoped for from ſuch a Suppoſal? Eſpecially ſince it follows, that the *Talmud*'s *calling the mix'd Cup the* Fruit of the Vine, *is no Proof our Saviour did ſo too.* And does he ſhew it is? He only tells us, *This Proof in concurrence with the reſt, I take to be*

(*t*) *Page* 74. (*u*) *Defence*, p. 51.

a good

a good one; and shall refer the Reader to what has been said already. And if the Reader can find any Satisfaction in what has been said, much Good may it do him. I heartily wish I could find Satisfaction in it too. But as yet I have not done it, and am pretty sure I never shall. But the Answerer had argued, *Perhaps the* Jews *might not call a mix'd Cup the Fruit of the Vine.* And does he disprove this? He only says, (*w*) Maimonides *and the* Talmud, (meaning *Maimonides* from the *Talmud*) *that is*, as he proceeds, *the best* Jewish *Authority, say they did.* As much as to say, if a Man resolves to take it upon Trust from the *Talmud*, he may. But if he will not do this, there is no elder, or more authentick Evidence to convince him. And who can help it, if there be no sufficient Authority to convince him? What follows from hence is very obvious, namely that he ought to desist, and not press for the Mixture, till he meet with such Conviction. *Perhaps our Saviour might not have his Cup mix'd. And perhaps, if our Saviour's Cup was mix'd, he might not design to enjoyn it as such.* Hereto our Author replies, *That our Saviour designed to enjoyn his own Institution.* And who doubts it? *And that the Mixture was Part of the Institution has been shewn already.* But where, I pray? I am sure I can find nothing like a Proof of it. However for a Conclusion of these Suppositions, our Author objects, that *here is nothing but Conjecture upon Conjecture against the Mixture.* As much as to say here is nothing but several Particulars, wherein our Author's Proofs want to be made out more fully. And if any one of these Conjectures prove true, his whole Scheme falls by it. Which makes it incumbent on him to prove very plainly

(*w*) *Page*, 52.

that the Anſwerer is miſtaken in them all. Becauſe till this is firſt done his Concluſion for the Mixture is very precarious. I add, that this Objection of proceeding upon Conjecture, were thoſe Conjectures much leſs to the purpoſe than they are, comes from our learned Author with the worſt Grace that can be; becauſe a great Part of both his Books are built only upon Conjectures; a plentiful Collection whereof might eaſily be made. But I forbear, and ſhall content my ſelf only to direct the Reader to the 63d and 64th Pages of his Defence; where I am much miſtaken, if he do not find as many Conjectures one upon another, as ever were met with in ſo little a Compaſs in any Author that ever was. Beſides that it is to be remembred, a probable Objection is not to be ſlighted, but anſwered; but an Evidence that is no more than Probable and Conjectural, will never ſerve to prove a neceſſary Duty.

Again, here is another Objection ſtarted by the Anſwerer, namely that according to Dr. *Lightfoot*'s Doctrine, *If a Man drinks Wine not mingled, he has performed his Duty. And why then has not a Chriſtian performed his, when only in Wine?* Yet ſays our Author, *This is but a lame Performance.* But if it were a ſufficient one, as it muſt be, or elſe he has not performed his Duty; if it be a ſufficient Performance he need not much concern himſelf for any hard Words that may be given it. Our Author ſays farther, *The Mixture ſeems*, (and indeed it more than ſeems, for it really was) *uncommanded by the* Moſaick *Inſtitution. But as I have proved, 'tis enjoyned by the Chriſtian. This makes a ſufficient Difference, and barrs Liberty in the latter Caſe.* In good Truth, it would make a ſufficient Difference, and put a final Concluſion to this Debate, could it but be once made out, and it is only for want of the Proof of ſuch a Difference, that

that I am not already, nor am ever like to be his Proſelyte.

It follows, (x) *Dr.* Lightfoot *affirms, That the Wine our Saviour made uſe of at the Inſtitution was mix'd with Water, if our Lord conformed to the Cuſtom of that Nation.* Which is arguing barely upon Suppoſition; and, ſo, very far from proving that he did ſo. But then the Doctor adds, in Corroboration of his Suppoſition, that *we have no Reaſon to queſtion it.* Which is ſtill but arguing upon what he takes to be a rational Conjecture; too weak a Foundation, as was but now ſaid, to build a neceſſary Duty upon. As it certainly is, notwithſtanding what he cites there from *Bab. Berachoth*; which aims only at proving that the *Jews* Cup of Bleſſing was mix'd, but ſays nothing of our Saviour's. Nor does the Doctor, or *R. Eliezer*, or any of *the learned Jews* pretend to ſay, that our Saviour enjoyned the Water as a neceſſary Part of this Inſtitution. Which is the Point that ſhould have been proved, but cannot. And therefore give me leave to ask again, and I deſire a fair Anſwer to it. If a *Jew* might perform his Duty in an unmix'd Cup, why may not a Chriſtian perform his in like manner? This is ſuch an invincible Rubb in the way, that I do not ſee how it could be got over, though I ſhould ſuppoſe the *Talmud* to be the beſt Evidence in the World, and the Diſtinction betwixt the *Fruit of the Vine and of the Tree*, to be as juſt a Diſtinction as ever was. But this I can by no means aſſent to, till what the Anſwerer had urged againſt it be fully cleared. (y) *By this*, ſays he, *one would think it was a common Diſtinction in our Saviour's Time, and that his Inſtitution was to be explained by it. But if we look into Dr.* Lightfoot

(x) *Defence*, p. 53. (y) *No Reaſon*, p. 41.

from whom it is cited, he says no such Thing. He only tells us that there is such a Tradition of the Rabbins, *but not how many Ages after our Saviour it might come into their Heads. And yet had it been a Tradition of the* Jews *in our Saviour's Time, to what Use would it have served? If the* Jews *would talk impertinently, I cannot think it necessary our Lord should do so too. What Tree can Grapes grow upon? Or of what Tree can Wine be produced, but the Vine only? Or what Vine ever produced Wine and Water? What the* Jews *therefore can mean by so unaccountable a Distinction, is to me so very Mystical, that I must beg to be excused, if I cannot imagine our Blessed Saviour would ever take up with it; and especially in so solemn an Institution as this of the Blessed Eucharist; or in truth that any manner of Regard is to be had to it.* Whereto our learned Author makes Two Replies, but how Satisfactory, I leave to the Reader's Observation. *First,* (z) *That this Distinction was Ancient and Common too, appears from Dr.* Lightfoot; *neither has the Answerer offered any thing to the contrary.* As to the Antiquity of it, the Answerer had desired it might be clearly shewn as Ancient as the Time, at least, of our Saviour. And for a very good Reason, because otherwise it is not at all to the Purpose. However, our Author has not so much as attempted this; though of such absolute Necessity to have been done. And as to the Commonness of it, Dr. *Lightfoot* does not say how many, or how few, they were that had any way made use of it. Nor does our Author say it for him, or any one else. *Secondly,* He says *His next Effort is somewhat extraordinary.* If the *Jews, says he,* would talk impertinently, I cannot think it necessary our Lord should do so too. *This Turn*

(z) *Defence*, p. 54.

is a little too ſtrong : I am ſorry to ſee him venture ſo far. But pray good Sir, where does his mighty Fault lie ? I muſt own, I have carefully peruſed the Words, and am not able to diſcover it. Is it that the *Rabbins* never talked impertinently ? This I will Anſwer for our learned Author, that he will not affirm. Or is it that he would have our Saviour to have talked impertinently with them, and more particularly in his Inſtitution of the Euchariſt ? The leaſt Suſpicion of this can never enter into my Thoughts. Where is it then that *the Turn* is ſo over *ſtrong ?* This is beyond my Ability to explain. He asks, *Wont the* Anſwerer *give the* Jews *leave to ſettle their Language, to aſſign the Notes of Diſtinction, and mark their Thoughts as they pleaſe ?* And I will undertake for him that he will ; and not only ſo, but when they have ſettled their Language to their Mind, he will give them leave to uſe it as impertinently as they pleaſe too. Only it is deſired, that if at any Time they make an improper Uſe of it, our Bleſſed Saviour may not be brought into the ſcrape with them. Which is ſure a moſt reaſonable Requeſt in it ſelf. But is more manifeſtly ſo in our Caſe, ſince as I ſaid before, it has not ſo much as been attempted to be proved, nor ever can it be proved, that this famous Diſtinction had been ever heard, or thought of, in our Saviour's Days.

It follows, (*a*) *The Phraſeology of Nations is extremely different, eſpecially the Eaſtern and the Weſtern :* And the Idiom of calling a *great Mountain*, or *Tree*, or *River*, &c. a *Mountain*, or *Tree*, or *River of God*, is brought to prove it. But what Service can be expected from this Obſervation, is yet to be explained. This was certainly a known Idiom of the

(*a*) *Defence*, p. 55.

Jews,

Jews, and uſed as ſuch in Scripture. But what Relation has this to *the Fruit of the Tree?* Or what Evidence is there of That being an Idiom with them too? The Scripture never once mentions this, though it often does the other. Nor will the Proof of this being an Idiom ever prove, that the other was ſo likewiſe. The Honourable and Ingenious Mr. *Boyl* obſerves, that in our own Tongue, there are Five or Six Expreſſions relating to *the Birth of Infants*, that would ſound very odly in another Language. Namely that (*b*) *Such a Woman has looked every Hour theſe Ten Days*; *Yeſterday ſhe cried out*; *She had a quick and eaſy Labour*. *Laſt Night ſhe was brought a Bed*; *Now ſhe lies in*; *Let us remember the Lady in the Straw*. Theſe are purely *Engliſh* Idioms; but it will never follow from any or all of them, that we call a Horſe a Mountain, or a Fiſh a Fowl. Nor again was that of the *Tree* properly an Idiom, but a Diſtinction. Nor again does it appear to have been a conſtant general Diſtinction amongſt that Nation, but only a Saying of ſome of the *Rabbins*, of which the Doctor tells us they had a Tradition. And it is too much to require that I ſhould depend more upon ſuch a Tradition, than upon the plain Words of our Saviour at the Inſtitution; Words ſo plain and clear that I never thought any Diſpute could ariſe about them, till I found this preſent Controverſy unhappily ſet on Foot.

Before I proceed any farther, I will beg leave to remind the Reader, that the Anſwerer had taken occaſion to obſerve what (*c*) *Buxtorf* had teſtified concerning the *Jews*, that they had Four Cups at their Paſſover, and that *they all conſiſted of Wine*; but ſaid withal he was *willing to ſuppoſe for the*

(*b*) *Style of the Holy Scriptures*, p. 13. (*c*) *No Reaſon*, p. 20.

preſent,

preſent, that the *Talmudiſts* were not miſtaken, and to inquire whether their Evidence would anſwer Expectation, even upon ſuch a Suppoſition. This our learned Author is pleaſed to take for a total giving up of *Buxtorf*, or in his own Expreſſion, (*d*) *an ordering him to withdraw*, and profeſſes he *cannot take it as any Point of Curteſy*. Though after all I cannot but think *Buxtorf*, to have been as well acquainted with the *Jewiſh*, both Language, and Cuſtoms, as Dr. *Lightfoot*, whom he conſtantly reckons upon as of unqueſtionable Authority; nor do I ſee why he ſhould not be as deſervedly *ordered to withdraw* as *Buxtorf*. And poſſibly it may be thought convenient to give him this Order, when I ſhall have told the Reader, that they both ſay the ſame Thing. For what *Buxtorf* had taught before, Dr. *Lightfoot* teaches afterwards, on St. *Matt.* xxvi. 27. that *Four Cups of Wine were to be drunk up by every one*. N. II. and that they were *to conſiſt of red Wine*. N. IV.

I will not trouble either our Author or the Reader, with a farther Inquiry, whether St. *Luke*'s, or the other Evangeliſts Account of the Euchariſtick Inſtitution is the longeſt, both becauſe it is of no Conſequence in the preſent Debate, and becauſe moreover every One's own Eyes are ſufficient Evidence, that St. *Luke*'s is the ſhorteſt.

The Anſwerer having (*e*) ſaid, that what *Plutarch* ſays of the κρᾶμα imports no more, *than that ſuch a Mixture may ſometimes be termed Wine*, our learned Author affirms *it imports more: It imports that ſuch a Mixture is commonly called Wine*. But whereas the Anſwerer explained his Meaning by what follows, *Not that Wine neceſſarily imports a Mixture, which were neceſſary for proving our Savi-*

(*d*) *Defence*, p. 29. (*e*) *No Reaſon*, p. 45.

our

our enjoined one, nor so much as that pure Wine was ever called κεκραμα; to this he replies, That *though Wine does not always import a Mixture, κεκραμα does.* Which is a plain Confession, that the Exception to this Testimony of *Justin Martyr* is well grounded, even according to his own Doctrine.

Dr. *Lightfoot* being said to have taught (*f*) the Mixture to be *a convenient Rite, as being requisite for Health, and avoiding Drunkenness*, his Answer is, that (*g*) *the Jews thought their Deliverance from* Egypt *imperfectly represented without the Mixture.* All that I am concerned in this Question is to know, whether the Answerer has cited Dr. *Lightfoot's* Words fairly and truly. That he has not, is not so much as pretended; and if he has, I hope he is not to be blamed for it. And if there be any Exception to the Words when fairely cited, let Dr. *Lightfoot* look to that; for the Answerer is no way concerned in it. All that he could desire in the Case, and which cannot be denied him, is that if Dr. *Lightfoot's* Evidence be allowed as unquestionable, when against him, it must be so likewise when on his side.

The Answerer inquires farther, (*h*) *If our Saviour were believed* in like manner *to have used it, because of the Strength of the Wine in those hot Countries, by what Argument can it be proved, that the same Mixture would be necessary in other Places where the Wine is thinner, and not more apt to intoxicate, than a mixt Cup perhaps might be amongst the Jews?* To this says he I reply, (*i*) *that the Sacramental Cup was no where drunk in such large Proportions, as to endanger Sobriety, tho' never so generous and undiluted; And therefore this could not be the*

(*f*) *No Reason*, p. 46. (*g*) *Defence*, p. 57. (*h*) *No Reason*, p. 46. (*i*) *Defence*, p. 57.

Reason

Reaſon of the Mixture. But our learned Author may conſider firſt, that if the *Jews* put Water into their Cup for this Reaſon, the Chriſtians might very well be at Liberty to leave it out, when the Caſe came to be altered, ſo as that there was no ſuch Occaſion for it; and again that there might be more Occaſion for ſuch an Uſage in Places where the Wine was ſtrong, than is amongſt us, and eſpecially when they met together very early, *in antelucanis cœtibus*, becauſe a little Wine taken at that time of the Morning, might cloud their Heads and render them leſs fit to ſerve God, than they would otherwiſe have been; though without any danger of drinking to Exceſs. In ſhort, if the *Jews* might, and did put Water into their Paſchal Cup for Convenience, why may it not as well be left out of ours when there is no ſuch Convenience in it?

But now comes an unhappy Queſtion, which I heartily wiſh our learned Author had forborn. (*k*) *If Water may be omitted, why not Wine?* And another juſt after, *Why may not any other Liquor do as well as Wine?* And I return one ſhort Anſwer to both; Becauſe our Saviour plainly tells us, what he inſtituted was *the Fruit of the Vine*, but ſays not one word of either Water, or any other Liquor.

The Anſwerer is charged with (*l*) *a great Miſtake*, in ſaying *We hear nothing of a Cup purpoſely mixt for this Uſe, till the Apoſtolical Conſtitutions.* And this *Miſtake* is affirmed to *appear plainly from the Teſtimonies of* Juſtin Martyr, Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and *St.* Cyprian, *above-cited.* Now I have again looked over that Part both of the Reaſons and of the Defence wherein theſe Wri-

(*k*) *Ibid.* (*l*) *Page* 58.

ters are cited; and find the utmoſt they are produced for is, to prove that our Saviour uſed a Mixture: Beſides it is urged in the *Reaſons*, (*m*) that *it is moſt reaſonable to ſuppoſe, that the Wine bleſſed by our Saviour for the holy Euchariſt was Part of that prepared for the Paſſover*, and conſequently not purpoſely mixed for the Euchariſt. And in the *Defence* are theſe Words, expreſsly contradictory to the Charge of *Miſtake* here caſt upon the Anſwerer; (*n*) *The Scripture gives not the leaſt Hint of any new Proviſion, of any Change in the Entertainment for the Euchariſt. 'Tis moſt reaſonable to ſuppoſe it the Remainder of what was prepared for the Paſſover.* Where then is this GREAT MISTAKE? Every one that cannot reconcile Contradictions muſt ſay, it is not in the *Anſwerer*, but the *Defender*.

I cannot but be much ſurprized at the next Aſſertion, it is ſo very ſtrange; (*o*) *It does not appear our Saviour kept the Paſſover with unleavened Bread.* So ſays our Author. But I cannot perſwade my ſelf he can think our Saviour would profeſs to keep the Paſſover, and yet act in ſuch direct contradiction to it's Inſtitution, as it would have been to make uſe of *Leavened Bread*; which was not ſo much as to be ſuffered in their Houſes, at the time of that Feſtival. As the Anſwerer had plainly ſhewn. I may inferr this alſo from our Author's own Doctrine. He ſays, (*p*) *Our Saviour's laſt Supper went upon a Conformity to the* Jewiſh *Paſſover*. And can it be thought our Saviour would comply with the *Jews*, in injoyning Water, which was not commanded them, any more than the Bread, Unleavened Bread,

(*m*) *Page* 9. (*n*) *Page* 30. (*o*) *Defence*, p. 58.
(*p*) *Page* 33.

which

which had been positively commanded? From hence it must be owned that *our Saviour kept the Passover with unleavened Bread*; and for this Reason because it was forbidden to do otherwise; Were nothing more to be said for it. But I must beg leave farther, to put this Gentleman in mind, that his Assertion is a flat Contradiction to the Testimony of three of the Evangelists, who all expressly declare against him. St. *Matthew* says it was on (*q*) *the first day of unleavened Bread* the Disciples came, to know where they should keep the Passover. So says St. *Mark*, (*r*) *The first day of unleavened Bread, when they killed the Passover, his Disciples said unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and prepare, that thou may'st eat the Passover?* And so again says St. *Luke*, (*s*) *Then came the day of unleavened Bread, when the Passover must be killed. And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare the Passover that we may eat.* This is undeniable Evidence, and as full as can be desired. And yet our learned Author has some Arguments to the contrary; though after such plain Testimonies from Scripture, one would think there could be no room for them. However that I may not seem to slight them, I shall briefly inquire into each of them. The first is that our Saviour kept his Passover a Night sooner than the time for eating the Lamb, and so did not eat the Paschal Lamb. But what he ate was on the thirteenth Day at Night, and so one the *first Day of unleavened Bread.* Which is all I am concerned for. *Farther*, says he, *by the* Mosaick *Law the Paschal Lamb was to be killed by the* Levites, *and sacrificed in the Temple at the Evening of the fourteenth*

(*q*) *Ch.* xxvi. 17 (*r*) *Chap.* xiv. 12. (*s*) *Ch.* xxii. 7, 8.

Day. Neither of which Regulations were practiſed at our Saviour's Paſsover. And is this a Proof that our Saviour could not keep the Paſsover with *unleavened Bread?* Or even that *it does not appear* he kept it ſo? If it be I will own my ſelf, as the Anſwerer was cauſeleſsly charged before, to be in a GREAT MISTAKE. Again he ſays, *Beſides, as the learned* Hammond *obſerves 'twas not neceſſary their Houſes ſhould be cleared of all* Leavened Bread *'till the Evening of the fourteenth Day.* Now I cannot deny that I have a great Veneration for Dr. *Hammond*; but withal that if he ſhould happen to contradict the *Evangeliſts* I muſt preferr their Authority before his. But does he ſay our Saviour made uſe of *Leavened Bread?* This cannot be pretended. Does he ſay, as our Author here affirms, *twas not neceſſary their Houſes ſhould be cleared of all* Leavened Bread, *till the Evening of the fourteenth Day?* Theſe Words are not to be found in him. Has he then any other that import as much? That I ſhall ſubmit to the Reader's Judgment, when I ſhall have recited what he ſays. Speaking of the Evening of the Thirteenth Day, that is of the Beginning of the Fourteenth, he declares that *this Day of the Paſsover being the Eve or Preparation of the* Seven days Feaſt *of* Unleavened Bread, *they were that Day before Sun-ſet to purge out, or remove all Remainders of Leavened Bread out of their Houſes.* But does this amount to ſo much, as ſaying it was not neceſſary to be done at the Beginning of that Day, If it were done then, it was certainly done before the next Sun-ſet. But it will not neceſſarily follow on the other hand, that if it be done towards the latter End of the Day, it is done ſoon enough. And we may be ſure when our Saviour ſet himſelf to keep the Paſsover, though he could not do it at the proper time,

because

becauſe he, the true Lamb of God, of which the Paſchal was but a Type, was to be offered up before that time, yet he would do it as perfectly as was conſiſtent with his time of doing it, and would not diſpenſe with a Divine Inſtitution, in a point wherein there was no Occaſion for a Diſpenſation. But the right State of the Queſtion is not, whether our Saviour could diſpenſe with Leaven in the Paſsover, but whether he actually did it. And this I am ſure our Author will not undertake to prove. This Argument is much the ſame as if a Thief upon the Highway, ſhould plead a Right to my Purſe, becauſe God could as well diſpenſe with him in taking it, as he did with the *Iſraelites* in ſpoiling the *Egyptians*. From all which Premiſſes I may ſafely conclude the Bread our Saviour uſed was unleavened; and I do not ſee how it could be otherwiſe.

We are told farther, (t) *We cannot inferr with any Cogency, that he took the mixt Cup only becauſe 'twas ready at hand.* I did not expect this would have been diſputed; becauſe the Force of all the Arguments for proving our Saviour uſed the ſame Cup that was uſed at the Paſsover, ſeems to reſt upon it. And ſo it muſt till ſome other Reaſon can be given for his pretended Inſtitution of a Mixture, than that he drank of, and appointed the ſame Cup that was then uſed. This therefore I looked upon as our Author's own Argument, and which he, not I, is concerned to anſwer, ſo far as it needs an Anſwer. But if ſo, *why will it not follow for the ſame Reaſon, that he made uſe of Wine, only becauſe it was ready?*

(t) *Defence*, p. 60.

I cannot

I cannot ſuppoſe our Saviour by any means to have acted with ſo little conſideration as this Queſtion inſinuates. Nor is there any the leaſt Pretence of Reaſon for it. Our Saviour who did nothing without the greateſt Reaſon would not act thus unreaſonably in a Matter of the higheſt Conſequence. And this is one Argument with me againſt his ſuppoſed uſe of a Mixture. But there are other good Reaſons to believe he did not make uſe of the Wine only becauſe it was ready; and ſuch as will not hold for the Suppoſed Water. This Anſwers to the Types in the Old Teſtament, and it moſt perfectly reſembles his Blood; and beſides it is what is mentioned as the Matter of the Cup. All which Conſiderations ſhew that a great deal may be ſaid for the Wine that cannot be ſaid for the Water; and beſides that, it is egregiouſly abſurd, and what therefore can never come into my Thoughts in the leaſt to imagine, that there is *no laſting Obligation to communicate in Wine, but that any other Drink may ſerve as well.*

Once more, the Anſwerer had argued, (*u*) *If it is a juſt Concluſion, that becauſe our Saviour mentions only Bread in the Inſtitution, therefore any Bread whether leavened or unleavened, is the proper Matter of that Part of the Sacrament; it naturally follows, and altogether with the ſame Reaſon, that becauſe he mentions nothing in the Cup but Wine, therefore any Wine will be ſufficient, whether mixt or unmixt. But here,* ſays our Author, (*w*) *the Reader may, pleaſe to obſerve, that though Bread is the Matter of the Sacrament, and conſequently neceſſary,*

(*u*) *No Reaſon*, p. 48.
(*w*) *Defence*, p. 61.

I add,

I add, and particularly taken, broken, and given by our Saviour, as the Evangeliſts declare, *yet the Kind of Bread is left at Liberty, Leavened or Unleavened is only an accidental Circumſtance. But the Mixture conſtitutes the Matter and ſeems to enter the Eſſence.* But this is very ſtrange, that a Mixture in the Cup of which the Scripture ſays not a Word, and which can never be proved to have been what our Saviour deſigned to inſtitute, ſhould be more eſſential, than ſuch a Mixture in the Bread, as the Scripture ſhews he muſt have made uſe of; and that *Do this* ſhould be of ſuch extenſive Obligation with reſpect to the former, of which there is no Proof, and yet ſignify nothing as to the other, where there appears ſo much more Reaſon for it. This is ſo plain, that our Author ſpeaks but diffidently as to the Obligation to the Water. *He ſays it ſeems to enter the Eſſence*; Which is a doubting Expreſſion, and intimates it not to be *certainly* Eſsential; which yet were neceſſary to prove the Obligation to reſtore it.

And now to ſhut up all in a few Words, *That the Fruit of the Vine was inſtituted* by our Bleſſed Saviour, is certain from Divine Revelation; that any Water was mixed with it is not ſo much as intimated in Scripture, nor taught as Neceſſary for ſome Ages after. The One was enjoyned by our Lord; the other not enjoined at all. How then can this be inſiſted on as Neceſſary to Salvation, without ſetting Tradition, whether Chriſtian or *Jewiſh* above the Word of God? And yet even upon this Suppoſition, the Tradition for it is ſo lame and imperfect, that it will never do the Buſineſs.

Thus I have gone through this Firſt Article; and have ſhewn in general, that Scripture is the only

only Rule prescribed to Christians, as able *to make them wise unto Salvation*; and more particularly as to the Mixture contended for, that the Tradition pleaded for it, is neither so Constant and Universal as is pretended, nor sufficient to prove a Necessity of this Usage where it is to be found. The natural and unavoidable Consequence of which Positions is, that as there is no Necessity for Restoring it, so neither can the Want of it any way justify a Rupture in the Church.

F I N I S.

637/40